COMPLETED
58 [H.A.S.C. No. 99-41]
Y 4. Ar 5/2a : 985-86/41
ORIGINAL

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZATION AND OVERSIGHT

HEARING

ON

H.R. 4180
[H.R. 4428]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

AND

OVERSIGHT OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED PROGRAMS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

CIVIL DEFENSE

HEARING HELD FEBRUARY 27, 1986

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
61-457 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

I

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

RONALD V. DELLUMS, California, *Chairman*

G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
EARL HUTTO, Florida
MARVIN LEATH, Texas
DENNIS M. HERTEL, Michigan
NORMAN SISISKY, Virginia
RICHARD RAY, Georgia
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas

KEN KRAMER, Colorado
G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, Virginia
WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, Alabama
THOMAS F. HARTNETT, South Carolina
DAVID O'B. MARTIN, New York
LYNN MARTIN, Illinois
BEN BLAZ, Guam

PAUL L. THOMPKINS, *Professional Staff Member*
ALMA B. MOORE, *Professional Staff Member*
MARILYN A. ELROD, *Subcommittee Professional Staff Member*
PETER M. STEFFES, *Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

PRINCIPAL WITNESSES WHO APPEARED IN PERSON OR SUBMITTED WRITTEN STATEMENTS

	Page
Alderman, Craig, Jr., Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense:	
Statement	10
Prepared statement	12
Becton, Julius W., Jr., Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency:	
Statement	2
Prepared statement	4
Dellums, Hon. Ronald V., a Representative from California, chairman, Military Installations and Facilities Subcommittee	1
DeVito, Donald A., president, National Emergency Management Association:	
Statement	32
Prepared statement	35
Stanley, Ellis, president, National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management:	
Statement	46
Prepared statement	47

IV

99TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4180

To authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for fiscal years 1987 and 1988, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 19, 1986

Mr. DELLUMS (for himself and Mr. KRAMER) (by request) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

---

A BILL

To authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for fiscal years 1987 and 1988, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, to carry out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, the sum of $126,565,000 and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, such sums as may be necessary.

○

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1987 AND 1988, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, H.R. 4180

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND
FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE,
Washington, DC, Thursday, February 27, 1986.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m., in room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC, Hon. Ronald V. Dellums (chairman) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA, CHAIRMAN, MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. DELLUMS. The Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities will come to order.

This morning the subcommittee will convene for the purposes of receiving testimony on H.R. 4180, the civil defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1987.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA's fiscal year 1987 budget request for civil defense activities totals $126.6 million, a reduction of 3 percent from the enacted authorization of $130 million for the fiscal year 1986.

The $126.6 million designated for civil defense represents about 37 percent of the total FEMA budget request of $469 million. The fiscal year 1987 request as submitted is intended to maintain the status quo pending final action within the administration on civil defense review mandated by House Report 99-235, the fiscal year 1986 fiscal report on the Defense Authorization Act.

We have been advised that the report on the administration review would not be available for several weeks, and that its transmittal to Congress would probably be too late for consideration during the mark up fiscal year 1987 budget request. However, because the review addresses the Civil Defense Program in 1988 and beyond, its effect will only impact on future year authorizations.

The Chair would like to note that we have received a communication as of yesterday afternoon from Mr. Becton, the Director of FEMA, requesting, and I quote briefly from the letter, "accordingly, I respectfully request an extension of the current deadline of March 3, 1986 to July 3, 1986 since it is impossible at this time to provide an approved administration position."

Without objection, the letter will become a permanent part of the record, and without objection, the subcommittee will see to the request.

[Letter from FEMA follows:]

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY,
Washington, DC, February 26, 1986.

Hon. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DELLUMS: This letter relates to the status of a report requested by conferees of the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services.

In the Conference Report on S. 1160, Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (House Report No. 99-235), the conferees requested that a report of the findings of an Administration review of civil defense objectives, policies, and programs be submitted to the Committees by March 3, 1986, to ". . . provide a basis for decision on the civil defense program for fiscal year 1987 and beyond."

The civil defense review is still in the process of final consideration within the Administration. Accordingly, I respectfully request an extension of the current deadline of March 3, 1986, to July 3, 1986, since it is impossible at this time to provide an approved Administration position.

The FY 1987 budget request for civil defense is set at $126.565 million, and the civil defense review addresses the program for FY 1988 and beyond. Thus the report of findings requested by the conferees will not directly affect decision on the program for ". . . Fiscal Year 1987 . . ."

I would appreciate your favorable consideration of this request. Please let me know if I may be of any other assistance.

Sincerely,

JULIUS W. BECTON, Jr., *Director.*

Mr. DELLUMS. This morning we are pleased to welcome the Honorable Julius W. Becton, Jr., who will be making his first appearance before the subcommittee as Director of FEMA.

As you know, Lieutenant General Becton comes to this job after an illustrious career with the U.S. Army, and the Department of State, where he headed the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, at the Agency for International Development.

General, we'd like to congratulate you on your appointment, and we certainly, on behalf of myself, members of the committee, and staff, welcome you this morning.

The Chair would indicate that without objection, the full text of your statement will appear at the appropriate point in the record, and we'd like you to proceed in any fashion you choose, sir.

STATEMENT OF JULIUS W. BECTON, JR., DIRECTOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, ACCOMPANIED BY DR. SAM SPECK, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT

Mr. BECTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm delighted to be here.

I have with me from my office Dr. Sam Speck, sitting on my right, Associate Director for State and Local Programs and Support, as well as other key members of my staff to my rear.

Mr. DELLUMS. I'd like to welcome all of you.

Mr. BECTON. We're also fortunate to have Mr. Craig Alderman, on my left, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. He's also appearing today in support of the fiscal year 1987 civil defense request.

Mr. DELLUMS. I'd like to welcome all of you gentlemen this morning.

Mr. BECTON. I appreciate the fact that you have my prepared statement to be put into the record. I would like to, however, make a few brief opening remarks.

As you pointed out, this is my first appearance before your committee as the Director of FEMA. My first 111 days, and this is the 111th day, have not been dull in the least.

A great deal of time has been taken up with budget matters, interspersed with natural disasters in Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, Washington, and, of course, your State, Mr. Chairman, just to name a few.

It has also included visits to all 10 regions, which I made a promise to do within the first 3 months of my tour as the Director.

In addition, we've had a wide variety of other things, such as more than 250 court litigations, and a fairly large number of GAO and IG audits and reviews.

Based upon my observations in all reports, I am proud to report that FEMA is fulfilling its mission to serve the public in times of emergency, and to assist State and local governments in their preparedness role.

My highest priority has been, and will continue to be, to establish integrity and credibility within the FEMA family, as well as the competence of the Agency. And I believe we are on track.

As you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, the President's fiscal year 1987 request for civil defense is for $126,565,000. This essentially continues the status quo of the 1986 current level of $130.8 million, pending final administration action on the revised CD review.

I believe the program should evolve in two directions: one, develop survivable State and local crisis management capabilities to permit them to aid their people in emergencies of all types, and, second, improve population support capabilities, including more emphasis on information for citizens to allow them to prepare themselves for all emergencies.

There were many disasters in 1985 which could probably be called the year of hurricanes. States on the gulf and the Atlantic coast were hit or threatened by Hurricanes Elena, Gloria, and Kate.

We also could call 1985 the year of evacuation. More than 3.1 million people were forced to be evacuated from low-lying areas by Elena and Gloria, as an example.

Another 500,000 people were required to evacuate by over some 200 natural disasters, such as floods, and technological threats, such as chlorine leaks, and so forth.

Civil defense plans, personnel and systems, once again, proved their value clearly. Such things as emergency operation centers have been operational and working—warning systems, the emergency broadcast system, emergency plans and organizations, all of which were tested and did well.

We, therefore, propose to continue the multihazard approach authorized by the Civil Defense Act, which we have implemented already through the integrated emergency management system.

This appears to me to be just plain common sense. At the same time, we propose to enforce the language of the 1981 amendment

BEST COPY

which said civil defense funds may be used for peacetime disaster preparedness, but only to the extent that this is consistent with, contributes to, and does not detract from attack related civil defense preparedness.

We cannot predict precisely what the results of this approach will be. In the large majority of cases we believe the State and local governments will agree. But in a few cases we might be required to decide whether to reallocate funds from a jurisdiction not including attack preparedness activities in its program to other jurisdictions which do.

I urge, sir, the fiscal year 1987 request for $126.6 million be approved. I thank you, sir, for the opportunity to appear before you, and will be pleased to respond to your questions.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JULIUS W. BECTON, JR.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate appearing before you today to review the President's FY 1987 request of $126.565 million for programs authorized under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

The U.S. civil defense program serves humanitarian ends, to save lives in natural and technological disasters and in national security emergencies. It is an essential element of the U.S. defense posture, as a system to protect life in time of national security emergency, as well as in catastrophic peacetime emergencies with potential impacts on national security. It is a matter of national priority that the U.S. have a civil defense program to protect population in disasters regardless of their source or nature.

In order that the Federal Emergency Management Agency can continue its responsibilities under the Act, it is essential that the full $126.565 million requested by the President be approved for 1987. These responsibilities are set forth in the Act, with particular reference to the 1980 and 1981 amendments.

Let me first put the 1987 request in the context of the current review of civil defense objectives, policies and programs. The 1987 request is some 3 percent lower than the 1986 current level of $130.815 million, including Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions. About half of the reductions reflect a government-wide policy of requiring more State and local cost-sharing for training. Thus, students at the National Emergency Training Center will be asked in FY 1987 to pay for travel and lodging as well as meals, whereas in FY 1986 they pay only for meals. The remaining reductions, of about 1½ percent, are spread through the other civil defense program elements.

The 1987 reduction is part of the overall governmental effort to reduce the deficit. The 1987 request thus provides in essence for continuing the status quo, pending final action within the Administration on the civil defense review.

The civil defense review will address the program in FY 1988 and beyond, and would thus affect future authorization requests. While final action remains to be taken on the review, I believe that the program should move toward evolutionary changes in two directions. One is to develop survivable capabilities for crisis management by State and local governments, to permit them to respond effectively in all emergencies to preserve civil leadership and continue essential support to the public. The second is to improve population support capabilities, including increased emphasis on providing information for citizens to allow them to prepare themselves for emergencies of all types.

May I quote from the declaration of policy set forth by the Congress in the Civil Defense Act, as amended in 1981:

"It is the policy and intent of Congress to provide a system of civil defense for the protection of life and property in the United States from attack and from natural disasters. It is further declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress that the responsibility for civil defense be vested jointly in the Federal Government and the several States and their political subdivisions * * *."

The mandate of Congress to the President—which he has delegated to FEMA—is to work in partnership with State and local governments to help preserve life and property and to provide protection from all major disasters.

In 1985, as in prior years, there have been tangible payoffs from investments in civil defense, as systems and capabilities developed under the program proved their worth in a variety of peacetime disasters. Last year, 27 disasters were declared by

the President to be major disasters, and involved the obligation of some $1.5 billion in Federal disaster recovery funds. The most destructive and costly occurred in November when both West Virginia and Virginia suffered severe storms and flooding.

In June, Pennsylvania and Ohio were struck by tornadoes. In September, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida were hit by Hurricane Elena, and Gloria threatened nine Atlantic coast States. Florida suffered damage in December from Hurricane Kate.

State and local civil defense systems and assets were put to the test in these and other disasters in 1985, which has been called the year of the hurricanes. It could also be called the year of evacuations. A total of 3.6 million people in 37 States were forced to evacuate by a variety of causes—about evenly split between technological threats, such as chlorine leaks and natural disasters such as floods and, of course, the hurricanes along the Gulf and Atlantic coasts.

Hurricane Elena alone required 1.7 million people to evacuate coastal areas. In fact, some were obliged to evacuate twice, as Elena veered about in the Gulf of Mexico before finally coming ashore near Biloxi, doing damage there and at other points along the coast. Hurricane Gloria, in late September, forced an additional 1.4 million people to evacuate low-lying areas from North Carolina to Massachusetts.

In the hurricanes and in over 200 other disasters, large and small, requiring people to evacuate, civil defense plans, personnel, and systems proved their value. Emergency Operating Centers were used by key officials of local and State government to direct operations; warning systems were used to alert the population; stations of the Emergency Broadcast System were used to advise the people on where to go and what to do; and evacuation plans were used by State and local forces in operations to assist the population to leave threatened areas.

The record is clear—that civil defense saves lives. It does this in the natural and technological disasters which strike each year, and it would do this as well should yet graver disasters threaten our people.

We propose, therefore, to continue the multiple-hazard approach which reflects mandates set forth by the Congress, especially in 1980 and 1981 amendment of the Civil Defense Act. This approach is based on common sense grounds. These include economy; multiple-use of scarce tax dollars; and increasing the effectiveness of local and State governments in dealing with emergencies of all types, including those emergencies which threaten the lives of some of our people, in some jurisdictions, nearly every week. More importantly, the multiple-hazard approach coincides with the way State and local governments actually prepare for disasters.

At the same time, we are mindful of language included in the 1981 amendments of the Act—which extended the statutory definition of civil defense to encompass dual-use of assets for peacetime disasters as well as attack upon the United States. The 1981 amendments included the proviso that funds made available to the States under the Act may be used by them ". . . for the purposes of preparing for, and providing emergency assistance in response to, natural disasters to the extent that the use of such funds for such purposes is consistent with, contributes to, and does not detract from attack-related civil defense preparedness." Our review of civil defense objectives, policies, and programs will be designed to strictly enforce this proviso.

Nuclear attack preparedness will never be achieved solely through an all-hazard, capability-building approach. Preparedness for nuclear attack requires for the most part the same kinds of emergency capabilities needed for peacetime emergencies. But nuclear attack so far exceeds the extent and severity of even the most catastrophic of natural disasters, that reliance solely on all-hazards, capability-building from the bottom up will not result in real attack preparedness. The Federal Emergency Management Agency remains committed to an all-hazard, capability-building approach as the best way to improve basic emergency capabilities, which moves us a significant way towards attack preparedness. But the experience of the past several years shows we must also direct resources to attack-specific requirements that will not otherwise be met.

We propose to assure, therefore, that the 1981 language is implemented in our management of funds appropriated under the Civil Defense Act—that all funds provided to the States for attack preparedness will be used consistent with that objective and to the greatest extent practicable continue to contribute to preparedness for all disasters, be they natural or manmade.

We cannot predict with precision just what the result of such an approach would be. We are confident that in the large majority of cases, States and local governments would be in full accord. The possibility remains, however, that we might in a few cases, after discussion and negotiation, be required to decide whether funds

should be reallocated from a jurisdiction which did not choose to pursue a genuinely all-hazards program, including attack preparedness, to other jurisdictions which did.

Within the funding requested for 1987, we propose to take initial steps in the directions suggested in the civil defense review. Thus the 1987 request includes a focus on plans and measures to improve the ability of State and local governments to endure and conduct operations to assist their citizens in emergencies of all types. This is reflected in a number of areas in our FY 1987 budget request. (More details on the 1987 program are provided in Attachment "A".)

In conclusion, I urge that FEMA's 1987 request for $126.565 million be approved. Humanitarian concern for the safety of our citizens, Presidential Directives, and the intent of the Congress expressed in the Civil Defense Act, including its 1980 and 1981 amendments, all dictate that we administer a program that supports the existing State and local emergency management infrastructure as both a national security asset and a vehicle for peacetime emergency response.

Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to respond to any questions that you and other Subcommittee members may have.

ATTACHMENT A—HIGHLIGHTS OF FISCAL YEAR 1987 CIVIL DEFENSE BUDGET REQUEST

FISCAL YEAR 1987 CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM REQUEST

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]

Appropriation and program	Fiscal year 1986 current estimate	Fiscal year 1987 request
Emergency management planning and assistance:		
State and local emergency management	55.267	54.835
Radiological defense	9.299	9.225
Population protection	11.484	11.393
Protection of industrial capability		
State and local direction, control, and warning	.539	.535
Research	.096	.100
Training and education	10.947	9.134
Telecommunications and warning	16.677	13.697
Salaries and expenses	26.506	27.646
Total	130.815	126.565

HIGHLIGHTS OF FEMA FY 1987 BUDGET REQUEST FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

FEMA's FY 1987 request for civil defense activities totals $126.565 million, a reduction of 3 percent from the FY 1986 current level. The FY 1987 request provides for maintaining capabilities to the maximum extent possible, pending final action within the Administration on a review of civil defense objectives, policies, and programs.

Outlined below are highlights of FEMA's FY 1987 civil defense request, in the order in which elements appear in the budget justification.

1. State and Local Emergency Management ($54.835M)

a. Emergency Management Assistance ($54.123M). This element provides matching funds to support State and local emergency management staffs, who provide the professional infrastructure for all-hazards preparedness.

b. Other State and Local Emergency Management ($0.712M). This includes funding for Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMA's), military reservists who assist State and local as well as FEMA offices in preparedness activities and during emergency operations. The FY 1987 request will permit continuation of the 1986 level, supporting some 400 Category "D" (paid) reservists. These reservists will be allocated primarily to the State level, with emphasis on enhancing State continuity of government (COG) efforts.

2. Radiological Defense ($9.225M)

a. Planning and Development ($2.445M). This program provides full funding for State and local radiological protection programs, in support of population protection and COG efforts. The States will assist 500 localities to develop or update radiologi-

cal protection annexes to their emergency plans, and will assist in testing and exercising 500 previously developed annexes.

b. Instrumentation ($6.780M). The existing stock of some 4.3 million radiological instruments, procured in the earlier 1960's, requires periodic maintenance and calibration. This is provided by approximately 125 State-level technicians, who will be supported in FY 1987 with full funding. The 1987 request also provides for continuing development of modern instruments, to provide a basis for procurement should funds become available in the future.

3. Population Protection ($11.393M)

a. Population Protection Planning ($7.975M). Starting in FY 1984 this element was broadened to include multiple-hazard planning at State and local level, including natural and technological as well as attack hazards. State planners assist localities to develop plans to protect the population from all hazards determined by vulnerability analyses to be potential threats to each specific locality. State-level planners will develop 500 state and local emergency operations plans and conduct 400 State and local exercises. Planning guides will be prepared for continuity of government activities.

b. Facility Survey, Engineering and Development ($3.418M). Engineering surveys identify structures providing fallout protection and protection against natural and technological hazards as well as structures which can provide temporary lodging for evacuees forced to leave their homes by any of a variety of hazards. Starting in FY 1984, an increased percentage of surveys was conducted by the States. The FY 1987 budget provides for support of State multi-hazard surveys of some 60,000 buildings in approximately 100 jurisdictions.

4. Protection of Industrial Capability ($0)

The FY 1987 budget requests no funds for activities related to protection of essential industry or key workers.

5. State and Local Direction, Control and Warning ($0.535M)

Efforts in FY 1987 will focus on the following:

Federal guidance for State and local governments on operations planning and procedures, on facility and system criteria, and on standards essential to national objectives (relating to State and Local continuity of government and to compatibility with the National Emergency Management System, NEMS).

Technical assistance and support to State and local governments in protection engineering, warning and communications systems design and planning, and electromagnetic pulse protection.

Continuing completion of State and local operational area Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) plans.

Providing electromagnetic pulse (EMP) protection for 10 EBS broadcast stations and 10 emergency operating centers.

6. Research ($0.100M)

A minimal research effort will be conducted in FY 1987.

7. Training and Education ($9.134M)

In FY 1987, training activities will be continued at approximately the 1986 level. Efforts in the area of instructional programs will include developing and conducting three new radiological courses. In the area of field deployment, approximately $5.5M will be provided to the States to conduct training at the 1986 level (some 5,000 courses nationwide, with some 100,000 students participating). Resident instruction will continue at the Emergency Management Institute at Emmitsburg, Maryland. The 1987 budget requests some $1.8 million less for training than in FY 1986. This reflects a government-wide policy of requiring more State and local cost-sharing for training. Students at the National Emergency Training Center will be asked in FY 1987 to pay for travel and lodging as well as meals, whereas in FY 1986 they pay only for meals.

8. Telecommunications and Warning ($13.697M)

The FY 1987 budget provides in general for operation and maintenance of existing systems, including the National Warning System (NAWAS, a landline system to provide warning of attack and of peacetime emergencies such as tornadoes and other severe-weather threats).

9. Salaries and Expenses ($27.646M)

The FY 1987 request provides for 508 workyears for program development and management. This is 8 more workyears than in FY 1986, but 10 percent less than the FY 1985 level of 564 workyears.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you very much for your opening remarks. The Chair will yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Ray, such time he may consume.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. I had to step out just a minute, and let me pass right now and come back, please, sir.

Mr. DELLUMS. Pleased to do it.

The Chair would now recognize Mr. Hutto for such time as he may consume.

Mr. HUTTO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, General Becton. Welcome. It's good to have you before our committee, and congratulations on your appointment.

I happen to live, I guess, in what might be referred to now as Hurricane Alley down on the gulf coast of northwest Florida in Panama City, but Elena for a period threatened the whole Panhandle of Florida, and I want to commend you and FEMA for the excellent work that you did down there. All that I heard was laudatory. People were seemingly very pleased with the work—with FEMA's participation in that effort to prepare people to evacuate and do whatever was necessary.

I guess my only question to you is this. This committee each year has sought, I believe, to make sure that FEMA's funding included resources for the local and State governments to participate in preparedness.

With the 3-percent reduction does this change the allocation to the local governmental bodies on civil defense?

Mr. BECTON. Basically this continues the status quo, as I said, sir.

Mr. HUTTO. OK, throughout then?

Mr. BECTON. Yes.

Mr. HUTTO. So that there wouldn't be any reductions?

Mr. BECTON. No reduction.

Mr. HUTTO. OK. What is your assessment of the work of FEMA during the worst hurricane season that we've ever had as far as threats are concerned?

Mr. BECTON. I would like to ask Dr. Speck to answer that because, as I said, I've been 3½ months on board. Before that I was concerned about some other disasters, the Mexican earthquake, the famine in Africa—up until November. So I can only attest to the fact that we looked across the city at what FEMA is doing, and we found they were doing very, very impressive work, as you pointed out.

But Sam lived through this, and I think can answer it better as to how we did it.

Mr. HUTTO. OK. Coming on board as you did, I guess another hurricane you had to contend with was getting used to the bureaucracy, huh?

Mr. BECTON. You'd be surprised how much people who deal with foreign affairs also deal with the bureaucracy.

Mr. HUTTO. OK. You're a veteran in that area. Fine. Thank you.

Mr. SPECK. Yes. Congressman, as you'll recall, we did a TV program together after the hurricane.

I think overall the thing that we were impressed with from that hurricane was how well the State and local communities performed. In that one series of hurricanes we saw something in the neighborhood of 1½ million people evacuate not merely once, but in your area, I think, twice. Some of the evacuation planning had been done under both our Hurricane Program, and Civil Defense Program. The latter is using civil defense dollars for basic planning through the EMA money that FEMA puts out there for building State and local emergency management infrastructure. The results show that this was having a positive effect. And I think it's important to see that tie between the specific dollars, like the Hurricane Program, the Earthquake Program that fund those elements of planning that are unique to a particular hazard, and tying that in with the money that you're looking at here for overall basic generic emergency planning, or planning for all hazards.

About 62 percent of the budget that you have before you in civil defense goes directly to the States, and if you couple that with the additional dollars going through planning support in our Individual Mobilization Augmentation Program, that is, the military people that come on to help plan on a temporary basis, and the linkage through the NAWAS system, which is used in hurricanes for emergency warning, it is even a higher percentage of money that is going out there to build that emergency infrastructure—so that the people do perform as well as you saw them perform in Florida.

Mr. HUTTO. OK, one final question, more or less of a parochial nature, but nonetheless important.

The civil defense, or Disaster Preparedness Office in Panama City is in a little county office that's really very inadequate. Just a small place. And I'm not sure at this point if all governmental units in my county are in accord with the central location elsewhere. But I know the City of Panama City Beach thinks that it should be there, and they should have an adequate building where much of the threat is.

What is the situation with building facilities necessary to control and manage a disaster like getting people to evacuate, and things of this nature?

Mr. SPECK. Mr. Chairman and Congressman Hutto, in that particular area we had been able to contribute money for emergency operating centers [EOC's] for equipment and on a 50/50 match basis for electromagnetic pulse [EMP] protection, for emergency broadcast system [EBS] development, and for some of the other things that had to be obtained, for example, the generators, the fuel supplies, et cetera.

It proved necessary, as we were forced to do some cutting and some reprioritizing in fiscal year 1986 to cut back very substantially in that area. As you'll recall from previous testimony last year, we indicated that we were going to focus on preserving, as it were, the people skills, which meant sacrificing to some degree the brick and mortar, or, if you like, the hardware or equipment that we had been putting out through the State and local direction, control and for warning grants.

For the bottom line, in fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987, we have not been able to provide hardware. We, however, are continuing to provide important guidance and technical assistance, and

conducting studies to make certain that we are prioritizing where those dollars should eventually be flowing in terms of EOC's, if future opportunities permit.

Mr. HUTTO. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair before going to the next colleague to ask questions would like to note that we already have Mr. Alderman at the witness table, and so, perhaps, it would be expeditious if we would allow the gentleman at this time to make his presentation, and then we can ask both gentlemen any questions. I think that would expedite matters.

So, Mr. Craig Alderman, Jr., who is the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy for the Department of Defense, is with us this morning, and the Chair would like to yield to the gentleman so that he may make his opening statement. Then we can come back to questions from our colleagues. And, Mr. Hutto, we'll not lose you. We'll come back so you can have an opportunity then.

Mr. HUTTO. All right; thank you.

Mr. DELLUMS. I'd like to welcome you before the subcommittee.

STATEMENT OF CRAIG ALDERMAN, JR., DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. ALDERMAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, members of the committee.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify on behalf of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's proposed Civil Defense Program for fiscal year 1987.

As in previous years, I can assure you that the program has the endorsement and support of the Department of Defense.

With your permission, I will only summarize here my written testimony, which has been provided to the committee, and which I would ask be entered into the record at the appropriate point.

Mr. DELLUMS. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. ALDERMAN. As you are aware, the Department of Defense and the National Security Council share responsibility for oversight of FEMA's Civil Defense Program. That responsibility derives from mandates we received several years ago from both the President by Executive order, and from the Senate Armed Services Committee: To assure first that civil defense planning continues to be fully compatible to the Nation's overall strategic defensive policy; and, second, to assure that the legitimate need of national security not be unintentionally subordinated to disaster relief in the programming.

Secretary Weinberger in his report last year recognized the mandate of this administration to complete an extensive and thorough review of our national civil defense objectives, policies, and programs.

FEMA, the National Security Council, and DOD, then undertook that review to provide a basis for decision on the future Civil Defense Program.

Pending the results of that review, we supported the fiscal year 1986 civil defense budget as a minimum essential to maintain the program elements currently in place, and today, with the review

nearing completion, we support the proposed fiscal year 1987 Civil Defense Program on an identical basis.

As the members of this committee know very well, while the role of the Department of Defense is to be prepared to go to war, the most fundamental purpose of this administration's Strategic and Conventional Force Modernization Program, arms control negotiations, and strategic defense initiative, is to prevent war, particularly nuclear war.

We, therefore, view commitments of national resources to civil defense with the awareness that their value as a deterrent, which, although not quantifiable, is nevertheless essential.

To deter nuclear attack, we believe it's possible, if not absolutely essential, to convince the Soviet Union that we have the resolve to deny its objectives, whatever military option it may elect to follow.

Now, as noted by General Becton, we believe that we can have a dynamic and effective nationwide Civil Defense Program. As an integral part of the overall strategic posture we seek to maintain, as a wartime capability to facilitate survival and reconstitution in all areas, such a civil defense program complements our military efforts to make war less likely.

To that end, we welcome FEMA's revitalized approach to civil defense, as mentioned by General Becton. We believe that we'll achieve the correct balance between attack preparedness and protection from all hazards.

In today's environment, it would be foolish for the Department of Defense, government at any level, or the private sector, not to realize that our Nation as a whole is more vulnerable to attacks of all kinds than at any other time in its history.

The Department of Defense, therefore, is working actively to develop military planning capabilities to support a more vital National Civil Defense Program. We will continue to work closely with FEMA as it develops civil defense plans and programs that could quickly enhance the safety of our homeland if we find it necessary to mobilize national resources for military action elsewhere.

Under FEMA's proposed fiscal year 1987 Civil Defense Program, and future programs as well, the United States acknowledges that disaster remains disaster, whatever its magnitude or cost, and that human suffering remains suffering, whatever its source.

Those programs also recognize that social responsibility requires that each level of government do what it can to prevent or mitigate disaster and suffering, rather than succumb to the paralysis of fear.

Summing it all together, Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1987 civil defense budget is a second consecutive minimum maintenance budget shaped by fiscal constraints, and by national security imperatives. We believe it is the very minimal level of support which a conscientious government can provide its people, its infrastructure, and its economy.

We, therefore, endorse the fiscal year 1987 Civil Defense Program as meeting the criteria of Executive Order 12148 within the context of a shared commitment to propose a fund and implement a more vital and realistic program in fiscal year 1988.

Thank you.

61-457 0 - 86 - 2

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CRAIG ALDERMAN, JR.

FISCAL YEAR 1987 CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I appreciate this opportunity to testify on behalf of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's proposed Civil Defense Program for Fiscal Year 1987. As in previous years, I also can assure you that it has the endorsement and support of the Department of Defense.

As you are aware, the Department of Defense and the National Security Council share responsibility for oversight of FEMA's Civil Defense efforts. That responsibility derives from mandates we received several years ago, from both the President in Executive Order 12148, and the Senate Armed Services Committee, to ensure that:

Civil Defense planning continues to be fully compatible with the Nation's overall strategic policy, and

Legitimate needs of national security not be unintentionally subordinated to disaster relief in programming.

In compliance with your instructions, we have annually provided for your committee's consideration, a written assessment of FEMA's proposed program, together with an analysis of the data upon which our assessment is based. For the FY 1986 program proposal, however, we found that such a written assessment and analysis would have very limited value to you or the Department of Defense; and we provided only letter reports to your Chairman and the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, as we do today.

Secretary Weinberger, in his report last year, recognized the implicit mandate to this Administration to complete an extensive and thorough review of our national civil defense objectives, policies and programs. FEMA, the National Security Council, and DoD then undertook such a review to provide a basis for decision on the Civil Defense Program for FY 1987 and beyond.

Pending the results of that review, we supported the FY 1986 Civil Defense Budget as a minimum essential to maintain program elements currently in place. Today, with the revised civil defense program nearing completion, we support the proposed FY 1987 civil defense program on the identical basis.

As in previous years, it is significant to place the Department of Defense position on the Nation's Civil Defense Program in perspective. As the members of this committee know very well, while the role of the Department of Defense is to be prepared to cope with war, the most fundamental purpose of the Administration's strategic and conventional force modernization programs, arms control negotiations, and the Stratetic Defense Initiative is to prevent war, particularly nuclear war. We therefore view commitments of national resources to civil defense with the awareness that their value as a deterrent, although not quantifiable, is nevertheless essential.

Our ability to deter direct attack on the United States by any foreign power is critically dependent upon convincing our potential enemies that any attack on the United States or its allies would yield no meaningful advantage, and would result in unbearable consequences. To deter nuclear attack, we believe it is possible—and indeed absolutely essential—to convince the Soviet Union that we have the resolve to deny its objectives whatever military option it may elect to pursue.

As noted in previous testimony, we believe that a dynamic and effective nationwide Civil Defense Program is an integral part of the overall strategic posture we seek to maintain. As a wartime capability for facilitating survival and reconstitution in all areas, it complements our military efforts to make war less likely. To that end, we welcome FEMA's revitalized approach to Civil Defense as mentioned in the Director's testimony today. We believe that it strikes the correct balance between attack preparedness and all hazards protection.

We have accepted the facts that the United States cannot or will not accept the massive underground shelter programs and widespread planning for government-directed evacuation which are a fundamental part of Soviet strategic and civil defense preparedness. Yet, even the most massive Civil Defense effort cannot eliminate vulnerability of large segments of any modern society—its population, its infrastructure and its industry—to devastating effects from nuclear war. Thus, while seeking first to deter any nuclear war by maintaining a highly reliable and destructive retaliatory capability, the United States also must prepare our society to protect itself, survive and recover if deterrence fails and attack comes.

Strategic planning today is made more complex by the possibility of nuclear coercion, whether from a threat of strategic attack by many nuclear weapons or from a threat of nuclear terrorism. We are unwilling to make the Nation's key physical assets and people hostage to intrusive and restrictive protection schemes. Therefore,

our only acceptable course for both protection, with warning before an attack, and effective response following a surprise attack, is preparedness—preparedness based on sound contingency planning, information, training and the willingness of individuals and institutions to protect themselves, or to recover, from known forms of attack if they are given the opportunity and the capability through effective leadership. Thus, as a new National Civil Defense Program evolves, we anticipate that it will encompass a somewhat broader and more flexible view of the levels of preparedness which the American people and their government bodies can undertake.

All recent United States civil defense programs have been modest, rather than massive, efforts; and we foresee no change in the absence of a clear and present danger. Yet, we also recognize that there must be substantial improvement in our civil defense programs in order to provide essential attack preparedness capabilities. The Department of Defense is working actively to develop and institutionalize military planning capabilities for effective support to a more vital National Civil Defense Program; and we will work closely with FEMA as it develops supportable civil defense plans and programs that can quickly enhance the safety of our homeland if we find it necessary to mobilize national resources for military action overseas.

In today's environment, it would be foolish for the Department of Defense, government at any level, or the private sector not to realize that our nation as a whole is more vulnerable to attacks of all kinds than at any time in its history. Over the years ahead, our evolving civil defense program should provide the vehicle for weighing and choosing new alternative preparedness measures in addition to the more traditional forms of protection.

Implementation of the President's defense build-up has demonstrated to the world our resolve to redress the strategic balance in the face of the Soviets' unprecedented acquisition and deployment of global attack capabilities. The prospects for negotiating realistic and meaningful arms reduction measures, therefore, continues to improve. Yet, the very concepts of freedom and democracy have relentless and purposeful adverseries, who are capable of bringing war to our shores or to our allies' homelands if there is significant evidence of a weakening American resolve to defend our interests at home or abroad.

Under FEMA's proposed FY 1987 civil defense program, and future programs as well, the United States acknowledges that disaster remains disaster, whenever its magnitude or cause, and that human suffering remains suffering, whatever, its source. The programs also recognize that social responsibility requires each level of government to do what it can to prevent or mitigate disaster and suffering rather than succumb to the paralysis of fear—with the Federal role being secondary to that of the State and local jurisdictions in most cases, and the Department of Defense having an even more limited responsibility for assistance than the Federal Government as a whole.

The National Civil Defense Programs completed and proposed from FY 1982 through FY 1987, actually do very little to lessen the likelihood of nuclear war or to give the American people a better chance of surviving a nuclear attack. Far greater commitments have been proposed to the Congress and rejected—commitments which nevertheless were well below the per capita civil defense commitments by comparable western nations and far below the commitment by the Soviet Union to its massive shelter and evacuation oriented civil defense programs. Obviously, the proposed programs lacked sufficient strength to muster the popular and Congressional approval required for budget support; and it is this need which DOD will seek to address with the NSC Staff and FEMA as civil defense programs for FY 1988 and later years become more specific.

Summing all together, FY 1986 is, and FY 1987 will be, a year of transition for civil defense concepts and programs. Yet, the current world situation, and the intent of the Congress and the population, appear to dictate that more be done now to prepare for defense against many potential consequences of war that could occur in the United States. As new approaches unfold, it is vitally important to maintain the civil defense capabilities currently in being, lest those essential resources for mitigating the effects of peacetime disasters, as well as nuclear war, atrophy.

The FY 1987 Civil Defense Budget therefore, is a second consecutive minimum maintenance budget, shaped by fiscal constraints and by national security imperatives. We believe it is the very minimal level of support which a conscientious government can provide its people, its infrastructure, and its economy. We therefore endorse the proposed FY 1987 Civil Defense Program as meeting the criteria of Executive Order 12148 within the context of a shared commitment to propose, fund and implement a more vital, though realistic, program in FY 1988.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Alderman.

The Chair would now recognize Mr. Ray, such time as he may consume.

Mr. RAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, General Becton, and gentlemen, welcome. We're glad to have you here this morning.

As I recall from the testimony before our committee last year, some States aren't making a contribution to the civil defense from their treasuries. Is that correct? Did I misunderstand that?

Mr. BECTON. As I understand it, some States are not making a contribution to all aspects of civil defense, including the nuclear attack aspect of it.

Mr. RAY. During these times of tight dollars, would we be wise to give consideration just to funding those States that do make at least a 50-percent contribution?

Mr. BECTON. You might have noted in my testimony, sir, that I made the statement, while we expect a large majority of the States and local governments to support and comply with the law, there may be some who do not, and it's our recommendation that if we have found some local governments like that, that we reallocate the funds to those that do.

Mr. RAY. Well, I would applaud that method of distribution.

Did I understand correctly, and it's because I don't know, and I should know, that the adjutant general in most States would be in control of civil defense through their section, their departments?

Mr. BECTON. I do not believe that is across-the-board correct. That's left basically for the Governor as to whether they have their adjutant general, or their Civil Defense Director, or their officer in charge of the disaster funds. I am told that maybe about half of the States have their adjutant general basically running the program.

Mr. RAY. Does your department with its limited funding have any way of monitoring the program where you can check to see just how well those individual States are doing?

Mr. BECTON. As you know, sir, we have 10 regions, and the regions have a responsibility for establishing the CCA.

Mr. SPECK. Comprehensive cooperative agreement.

Mr. BECTON. Which is a written agreement between a State and the Federal Government.

The regions also have a responsibility to monitor. Quite frankly, the regions have been handicapped because of the lack of travel funds. But we do have the responsibility.

Mr. RAY. Does the Governor's office of the State seem to have a strong interest in civil defense in most instances, or are they just really putting it on the back burner?

Mr. BECTON. I'll ask Sam to respond to that because his people are out there and much closer in that respect.

Mr. SPECK. Congressman Ray and Mr. Chairman, I think that you'd have to say that most all Governors have a strong interest in preparing to deal with the hazards that they believe may confront their people. Where you get less interest than some of us might like to see is the priority some Governors give to the attack-related hazard and the emphasis or deemphasis they give, has had an impact on the all-hazard approach to planning. We have to look at how that comes out not only in terms of what they say, but what they do, and we've tended to look to what they do rather than sometimes what they say as a result of political pressure.

Mr. RAY. But I try to make it a point to drop in to the various counties where the programs are handled, and I'm told that my State has a very good program, but I'll have to be real candid with you, I'm not very well impressed with what I see in there. Maybe it's my fault for not digging in deeper. I plan to do that with the adjutant general.

Mr. BECTON. That would be most appreciated, sir.

Mr. RAY. At the same time it seems to me that I guess because we don't have quite the dangers with cyclones, tornadoes, or earthquakes in my part of the Nation, as other States do, that we get a little bit complacent.

However, I'm just concerned that we are geared up to do what we ought to do.

Mr. SPECK. Congressman, one of the things that we just put out this past year to respond to your very concern is a new piece of guidance called CPG 1-8, that details what is expected to be in those emergency operating plans, and another piece of guidance, CPG 1-8A, which provides for a checklist that the States and ultimately local governments will go through as to what's expected to be there, and to make certain that that is happening. To ensure compliance we not only are looking at that at the regional level, but we're bringing a percentage of those emergency operating plans into headquarters, and reviewing them, to make certain that there is some substance in those programs.

Mr. RAY. I guess my final comment will just be a comment. I passed through an urban area, a fairly large urban area just a few weeks ago, and three civil defense vehicles were sitting on the lot about 10 or 12 years old each. Two of them had flat tires. They also had civil defense splattered all over them. It kind of gave me a bad feeling about civil defense to see that type of situation going on.

But anyway, I'm a supporter, and want to help all that I can, and I appreciate your testimony this morning.

Mr. BECTON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. DELLUMS. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. Ortiz is now recognized for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. ORTIZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Congratulations on your appointment, General.

Mr. BECTON. Thank you.

Mr. ORTIZ. My State is having a severe financial problem at this time, as you're aware. We're having a problem because of the oil crisis that we have, and my State is expected to lose $1.3 billion this year.

And I am a great believer in training, and in looking at your statement here, you said that you're going to require the States to pay their share to attend this training. Of course, Texas is a big State. It takes a long time to get from one end to the other.

How much money are we thinking about saving by going through this reduction?

Mr. BECTON. Sir, I don't have an exact number. I'll get that for the record. But I'd like to point out that the Administration has taken that approach in all Federal schools, not just for the National Emergency Training Center, but for the FBI Academy, and so forth.

It is the belief that the State and local governments will have to pick up a greater share of the responsibility. We are providing the education. They are providing the transportation, lodging, and food.

I am told that there will be a $1 million saving in the stipend.

Mr. ORTIZ. Thank you. We're very familiar with FEMA. I'm from Corpus Christi, TX, and you certainly—your staff and your people have played a tremendous role, and we haven't had a big hurricane—we're due for one, and this is why I'm very much concerned.

Mr. BECTON. I hope you don't have any.

Mr. ORTIZ. But I certainly appreciate your efforts, and I just hope that maybe something can be done. The reason I ask this question is because of the financial crisis that my State is going through. In fact, the Governor came out with a 13-percent reduction in our State funding budget, and one of the things that will be cut will be traveling funds, which means that this is going to deprive the State of Texas, those involved in civil defense work, from attending any kind of school because we just have to tighten our budget like the Federal Government has. I hope that maybe some way if you have any spare funds available to let us know because we need to send some of our people to attend these training sessions.

Mr. BECTON. Recently, sir, while traveling in your State I talked to the fire chief in Fort Worth, and I raised the question as to what his judgment would be of the impact of the reduction of stipends. He said, "Well, it would hurt, but we feel that, based on what is happening in Emmitsburg in terms of training the trainer, and its being a school of excellence, we cannot afford not to go, and we will find the funds someplace."

Clearly, that's one person's view. I realize there are other places in Texas.

As an example, I have spent more time in Texas than any other part of the world. It's where I went to school, Prairie View. I doubt if they will be able to provide the person to go to school. We would certainly hope that we could find some way that that could be done.

We are still giving some funds to the State; Sam your writing is atrocious.

Mr. SPECK. I apologize, Director. If we had more training money maybe I could get to improve my writing. [Laughter.]

Mr. DELLUMS. You lobbed the home run ball in.

Mr. SPECK. You've got to catch them while they're hot.

We still will be providing out some $5.7, about $6 million in 100 percent funds to the States for training at the State level, as well as the training that is going on at Emmitsburg.

Mr. ORTIZ. We appreciate that because the district that I represent, of course, at one point we were very, very much dependent on the Mexican economy, and again, you know what has happened to the peso. You know, it's 500 to 1, so the economy is down, unemployment is high, and the cities are not getting the revenue, and it's very, very hard for our citizen counties, but I certainly appreciate all you have done, and I will continue to work with you.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BECTON. I should point out one other thing, if I may, sir.

Mr. ORTIZ. Yes.

Mr. BECTON. We are looking at better and more effective ways, of giving the training out to the regions, so that folks from El Paso, Corpus Christi, or whatever, won't have to come to Emmitsburg, but maybe can travel to Denton, or to some other place in their region.

Mr. ORTIZ. Yes.

Mr. BECTON. We're exploring that. We think there is great potential there.

Mr. ORTIZ. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. The Chair would like before going to our next colleague, ask in response to Mr. Ortiz, did you say that you're saving $1 million as a result of doing away with training stipend, or does that $1 million also include your suggested change in room and board policy at the National Emergency Training Center?

Mr. BECTON. That's total stipend, I believe.

Mr. DELLUMS. That's stipends alone?

Mr. BECTON. Stipends alone.

Mr. DELLUMS. So how much would you save from changing the room and board policy?

Mr. SPECK. It's about $1½ million total.

Mr. BECTON. About $1½ million total, sir.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you. Thank you very much.

The Chair would now recognize Mr. Martin for such time as he may consume.

Mr. MARTIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Very brief, and I regret I'm not going to be here for the entire session. I'm going to reacquaint myself with the Readiness Subcommittee, which I haven't in some time.

Welcome, and congratulations, General.

Looking at the budget here proposed in the savings, I note that we're talking about $3 million reduction in telecommunications and warning.

Can you give me an idea as to why in limited times that was selected as something with the heaviest reduction in next year's budget, and how we were able to do that?

Mr. BECTON. Basically, in the process of determining how we can live within the budget that we had for 1986, and how we shall look to 1987, I made the determination that, rather than taking an across-the-board percentage cut, we'll look at major programs that we could either eliminate or reduce and still not impact adversely on the overall operations.

Telecommunications, granted, is antiquated in some respects, but is still effective. A radio that worked in 1955 can still work in 1985, or 1987. It won't be as effective, but, as opposed to something else where we could not do without, that's the reason we took the reduction in telecommunications.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there anything that was planned in prior year's budget for the long term that is going to be interrupted, or stopped, because of the cut of some $3 million, which is quite a bit of money when you're talking about $16 million, or something?

Mr. BECTON. We would hope that the priorities that have been established in the past, and we certainly would continue, will permit us to address telecommunications for the outgoing years. As

we mentioned, as part of the review of the civil defense by the administration, we'll take a look from 1988 on.

If we find that we don't have sufficient funds, we will certainly request funds to take care of that.

This also delays the upgrade of our radios. We realize that. But again I point out, radios that are upgraded are very fine. Radios that are not upgraded, but still work, will still accomplish the mission.

Mr. MARTIN. Thank you, Director, and to the Director and Mr. Secretary, I just want to make an observation.

I came on this subcommittee at the same time that Don Mitchell, or a member from New York, was retired. And, as I'm sure you know, he was a great advocate for FEMA, civil defense, when he was here, and continues to be so as one of my constituents.

Every time we have a new round, start out with new faces, I guess we ought to forget about what went on in the past.

The comment that the Secretary makes, why this budget, and, again, why we're waiting for this study that's supposed to come in 30 days?

Mr. BECTON. We've asked for a 4-month delay to get the complete review before Defense and the National Security Council.

Mr. MARTIN. This is the minimum essential to maintain the program elements currently in place, I guess during that period of time, until we decide where we're going.

It's unfortunate that the first budget, Mr. Giuffrida was here, that I was involved with, was the minimum that was required, and the minimum that we could live with.

And I believe the chairman, the committee, and I, engaged in an exchange of ideas, and didn't necessarily agree. The chairman thinking the funding was too high, and I was thinking it was about right, or whatever.

The following year we met again without an awful lot of warning, no pun intended, on the subject we're talking about, and we came with a budget well below what I thought the chairman might, even acting as a devil's advocate, ask, but they were asking for well, less than what they wanted to, and it kind of undermined the credibility of the whole program, quite frankly.

And so you have not only the responsibility of making sure that the program is what it ought to be, but all the people I've been involved with in the program, I guess, addressed to yourself as anyone, to take the challenge of reestablishing that credibility, which, you know, took a big, big hit on that occasion.

So if people ask you are you sure this is the minimum that you could live with, you can understand that it's nothing personal. It's just that having lived through that experience a lot of people would question that, and have good reason to even if I don't agree with them.

So I wish you the best and anything that I can do, even in the course of the hearing, and my office is open. Please let me know.

Mr. BECTON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. DELLUMS. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Dickinson for such time as he may consume.

Mr. DICKINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Becton, I came to make my annual speech to FEMA. Since this is your maiden flight here I thought I'd come and give you the benefit of it. I do this every year. It doesn't do any good, but I feel better after it's done.

I am concerned and convinced that with the Department of Defense and our military budget being under constant attack, as it has been the past several years, and as an example, if Gramm-Rudman is triggered, while Defense has some 29 percent of the Federal budget, we'll take 50 percent of the cuts.

That was just a reflection, I think, of the attitude of Members of Congress, which pretty well reflects the attitude of the people across the country perhaps.

But you have an infinitesimal part of your budget that goes to actual defense. You're really in the civil disaster business. I notice the agency with which you were formerly associated, you headed the Office of Foreign Disaster, I really am convinced that if we had the wisdom to change just the label on it without changing any substance, and refer to the appropriation and the authorization and appropriation process, as civil disaster aid instead of civil defense, which conjures up the old image of running around with a tin hat on, and CD, and the triangle, and the vehicles with the flat tires on them that Mr. Ray is talking about, you'd get a lot more sympathy out of people. There is not an area of the country that has not had a civil disaster, fire, mudslides, hurricanes, floods, you name it.

And these are civil disasters, and this is really what takes up most of your budget, most of your time. And I would like to urge on you that if you could internally, and it wouldn't take any big upheaval, I don't think, to—if we could get away from the term and terminology, usage of civil defense, so that you don't think about the military, and defense budget, but think about helping people, which is what you're in the business of doing—you know, if a new atomic bomb really goes off over here, and we get into it, you're going to be out of business anyway, I think. I don't think you'll have much to do. Not going to be many people around to do it with.

But, for the past 20 years, 30 years, you've been in the business of helping people, your agency, overcome civil disasters, and we've been the beneficiary of—in my district, of many instances, obvious, hurricanes, tornadoes, flooding, and I really think we could get a lot more popular support, and you could more easily get an increase of your budget by—if you worry about cutting the stipends is one thing—if you could just transform the attitude of public thinking toward FEMA, and the agency within FEMA, so that everybody understands that we're not out here trying to worry about the fallout shelters, the exchange of ICBM's. What we're doing is helping people overcome the ravages of nature, for the most part, and this is a civil disaster, not civil defense.

And if you give that some serious thought, and I've been harping on this for some time now, I really think in the long run it would be most beneficial to you and the agency, and would help us do our job up here by not being under attack as part of the military establishment.

So having said that, let me again welcome you, and I'm sure yours is an interesting job, and we'll be working with you for some time to come.

Thank you, Mr. Director.

Mr. BECTON. Thank you, sir.

I would like to——

Mr. DICKINSON. Please.

Mr. BECTON. Sir, you did make a comment that you think if "an atomic bomb goes off we're not going to be here." We are going to be here because we, FEMA, have 10 regions spread from coast to coast, and I don't think anyone anticipates the threat is such it will wipe out the defense posture.

Mr. DICKINSON. Our chairman does. I was talking with a fellow the other day and he said, you know, if an atomic bomb went off, where would you rather be? And he said, I want to be standing right by the side of the fellow who says, "Hmm, what was that?" [Laughter.]

Mr. DELLUMS. Are you going to leave me to follow that? [Laughter.]

The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair would like to ask a few questions.

First, does FEMA still intend to open and operate the Western National Emergency Training Center, and if not, can you tell us why you choose not to open it?

Mr. BECTON. Mr. Chairman, I found that at the time we started looking at our funding status, we could not at this time continue or pursue the subject of the National Emergency Training Center West in Nevada. We felt that part of our challenge was a revisit of the need for having it. If we are reducing the number of students coming in because of stipend cuts, if we are also faced with trying to develop a school of excellence complete across-the-board, we felt that because of the funding situation we would have to hold the NETC West in abeyance.

Mr. DELLUMS. As we looked at your overall budget, and as I said, it has been significantly reduced overall from last year, and that specific part dealing with attack-related civil defense, has also been reduced some miniscule amount, but it has been reduced.

It appears as if the only category where there is an increase, is in the category of research, can you tell the subcommittee how you plan to use these funds, and what is your rationale for increasing that particular area?

Mr. BECTON. Sir, I will have to get some assistance on that.

Could I introduce another associate director?

Mr. DELLUMS. Please do.

Mr. BECTON. For plans and preparedness, Bernie Maguire.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, you're correct in observing that there is a miniscule increase in research. I believe the total amount requested for fiscal year 1987 is $100,000 in program funds.

As you're aware, our plans with regard to research in emergency management are to utilize research that's going on throughout the Federal Government where it's helpful in emergency management areas.

As a contributor, and a participant in gathering this information, on a number of occasions we were asked to contribute to large re-

search programs. We are intending to use the $100,000 funding as effectively and efficiently as possible in contributing to some of those large research programs—to be able to participate, gather the information, and utilize it as best we can throughout the agency.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you.

What factors, Mr. Becton, are you looking at in your current review of civil defense, and would the review examine the value of the Crisis Relocation Program that you had in the past?

Mr. BECTON. Basically, sir, we're still using the integrated emergency management system approach for all hazards from the one extreme of dealing with a disaster such as a hurricane, flood, or a massive fire, to the other extreme, the nuclear attack.

The requirement to look at crisis relocation is certainly a valid observation, or a valid effort, but that must be a decision on the part of State and local governments, just as well as the subject of providing shelters, or hardening them. It's a function, and I think it will have to continue to be a function of what the State and local government can best do based upon their situation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Well, then, is your answer to my question with respect to the crisis relocation plan that that has to—that whether you move away from that is contingent upon input from the State and local communities?

Mr. BECTON. Basically, it's their decision as to whether they attempt to relocate, whether they attempt to harden, or something in between.

Mr. DELLUMS. All right. Then let me go back to the A part of my question, and that is that if this entire program is under review at this moment, then what factors are you looking at in the review? What constitutes the review? What's the basis for the review? Am I asking a clear question?

Mr. BECTON. Yes. I'm going to also ask for the two gentlemen who helped participate in that review to comment.

Sam, would you want to start first, and then followed by Bernie?

Mr. SPECK. Right. I think there are a couple of factors, Mr. Chairman. One factor is the whole issue of what will work and what won't work in terms of developing an all-hazard capability with an attack-related element in it. That effort involves looking at some of the new kinds of issues that have developed very recently, for example, SDI, and what implications that has. It has to do with a reassessment of our understanding of enemy targeting, and other threats we may be facing that would generate the need for a review.

So these kinds of factors are going into it.

The review takes a look at evidence we have in that very area you mentioned of evacuation where we're seeing that people are going to evacuate spontaneously in the face of a hazard regardless of whether the Government gives them direction to do so. And thus, at the least, we have to be prepared, whether it be a hurricane, a nuclear powerplant incident, or attack, to be of assistance in a spontaneous kind of evacuation.

Another factor, I think, has to do with fiscal reality, and the signals that have come from Congress in the past, that maybe they weren't prepared, given the budgetary constraints that we're

facing, to support a program of the level that was previously projected. And thus, it involves a review in the sense of where do you reprioritize and target resources if you have somewhat more limited resources than you may have had when you projected a buildup in the civil defense area in the first place.

So I think all of those factors have generated things that will be part of our consideration as we draw to a close on this review and bring it to you.

Mr. BECTON. Mr. Chairman, if I may ask Mr. Maguire to make a comment because he is our point of contact with the National Security Council and the Department of Defense.

Mr. DELLUMS. Please.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, we are working very closely with the Department of Defense and the National Security Council to formulate the program for the outyears.

I would only add to what Dr. Speck has stated, that Director Becton has brought to the Agency a reality that we need to go back to our statutes before proceeding with any programs that FEMA undertakes. One of the very first factors that we have considered is the Civil Defense Act, and all provisions of that act, before formulating any programs that are intended for the review that we're doing right now.

We've taken those executive orders that FEMA has to operate under. They are our basic criteria in addition to what Sam has said.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you. Let me then frame the question slightly different and ask Mr. Alderman from the Department of Defense; ask the question in this fashion: What methods are you now looking at? Well, first of all, let me ask, are you preparing to move away from the Shelter Program, and the population evacuation method, and if you are, what other methods are you now looking at that you're considering recommending as part of the review and the direction for 1988 and beyond?

Mr. ALDERMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to that by setting a little bit of background scene first.

I want to talk about strategic defense in lowercase letters, not the SDI yet. And, for 30 years the strategic defense of the United States has been based on a combination of our offensive strategic power to deter war and our ability to negotiate with our friends and allies.

Twenty years ago we brought a second element into this, and that was the arms control process whereby we hoped to reduce the overall level of arms around the world, and hence, the threat of a possible strategic nuclear war.

And more recently we have initiated a third element in that, and that's upper case Strategic Defense Initiative, which we look at as one possibility for an active defense of our homeland.

The first is still our primary reliance—the deterrence through offensive forces. But, an element of that deterrence, is to insure the protection, or the survival, of a significant portion of our population, our infrastructure, and our society, in the event that deterrence fails.

So our approach to this, to a review of the Civil Defense Program with FEMA and the NSC, has been to say, "All right, we have a

mandate with the Civil Defense Act, and various amendments. We have an imperative from our national security strategy. We are apparently not doing something right because we have been unable to get our initiatives funded and supported, either in the Halls of Congress, or in some cases, by the population of the United States."

We are attempting in the review to determine how to provide that minimum essential protection and recovery capability for the population in a manner that will contribute to our strategic defense (lower case), and at the same time, be supportable by the Congress and the people.

Now, to come to your specific question, if people exist in a potential target area, there are only three things that you can do to protect those people. You can either move them out of the area, or you can shelter them in the area, or you can stop the attack from coming in the first place.

Our review has been to look at all three of those, and what combinations are practicable in the climate of the United States of America in the middle 1980's.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you. Let me just follow on, Mr. Alderman, with a couple of questions. Then we'll move back to the FEMA people.

As you know, the SDI Program is controversial at a number of different levels, but I want to zero in on one difference of opinion within the community that supports SDI.

One group feels that SDI can evolve as a defensive program for the populace.

Then there's another school of thought that says at best SDI ends up defending a nuclear arsenal. Is that controversy—are those two positions being discussed in the context of your present review, and if the point of view that says SDI ultimately comes out on the side of defending our nuclear arsenal, then how does SDI relate back to the concept of civil defense that obstensibly deals with the people side of this question?

Is my question clear?

Mr. ALDERMAN. Yes, your question is clear.

Mr. DELLUMS. If it's not fair then let's move on. If that's beyond your pay grade we'll ask someone else.

Mr. ALDERMAN. No, civil defense supports both of the legs of that question.

First of all, I'm not an expert in SDI, but SDI at this point is a research effort to determine the practicalities of developing an effective system, and the method of carrying out those practicalities.

In any event, assuming that it is practical, and we do determine how we can do it, it's going to be a phased process of installation. One doesn't suddenly create an umbrella over the entire United States of America. One prioritizes what one wants to put that umbrella over and builds the first umbrellas first.

That sounds like I'm talking down to you, and I'm not.

The decision, as far as I know, as to what to protect first, has yet to be addressed by the administration, and so we are not addressing that question in the current civil defense review.

But in the back of our minds, as we do this, is the long-term objective of being able to provide a complementary system which sup-

ports what we already have in being, in the form of a strategic defense.

So that as we work the current program for the near and midterm, we can connect to a strategic defense when we arrive out there if that ever becomes a practicable option.

Mr. DELLUMS. So can I conclude from your remarks that one of the reasons why the review is taking such a long time is because many of these issues have not been worked out in the context of the administration with respect to civil defense, and the issues of SDI and its relationship to this apparently has also not crystallized at this point, and one of the reasons why you're asking for additional time is because you just haven't come to any bottom line on these complex questions like SDI and its relationship with civil defense?

Mr. ALDERMAN. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I would say that one of the reasons that we haven't come to the bottom line is that there are a number of complex issues. SDI is only one of them, and we are trying to develop a program which is practicable in the nearterm, and practicable in the midterm, and will lead us to wherever we want to go in the longterm, and will be supportable by you and the other Members of both Houses of Congress, and the American people.

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate that.

Just one additional question. In the course of your opening remarks you stated that near the end of your remarks, and I made a little note, you said that we were more vulnerable at this point in time to attack than ever before. Very powerful, very direct, forthright statement.

Can you tell the subcommittee the basis upon which you have arrived at that conclusion?

Mr. ALDERMAN. Yes. I will clarify that, if I may, before—I'm not speaking about February 26, 1986. I'm talking about the decade of the 1980's as opposed to earlier decades.

When we—how much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DELLUMS. We're here to listen to you.

Mr. ALDERMAN. OK. In the late 1960's we had nuclear superiority—we, the United States of America. We had the ability to project our power unchallenged in conventional modes by air and by sea to any point in the globe.

Because we had this, we accepted a large conventional force overhang on the part of the Soviet Union, convinced that our strategic nuclear posture—our superiority—would deter any conflict that may open. We also were convinced that if that perhaps deterrence should by mischance fail, then we, by the control of the escalation of that conflict, could bring it rapidly to a conclusion.

In the decade of the 1970's, this radically changed. The Soviets increased, modernized their strategic nuclear forces. We lost supremacy, our superiority. I'm not certain what I'm supposed to call it anymore. But—though I won't give it a name now—if I had to, I would say we're roughly on balance.

That increases the threat to us, sir. The Soviet Union has been taking its lesson from our own capabilities; it has increased from a brown water Navy to a blue water Navy; and it has done the same for its Air Force. And, we now find the Soviet air and naval forces

at all corners of the globe, with power projection almost equal to ours. That increases the threat to this country.

The large conventional forces maintained by the Soviet Union and her allies, and her surrogates, have not only been expanded, but they've been modernized, with first-rate, first-line equipment, and they're superbly trained. That increases the threat to us.

We have, in this administration, recognized these threats in the late 1970's and nearly 1980's; and as you're aware, we have undertaken a number of programs to redress, to restore our positions—whereby we will restore our deterrence and our strength, both in the strategic nuclear equation, and in the conventional force equation.

We're working to reduce the threat, but the threat is still significantly different now than it was 20 years ago.

Now, I could probably go into the terrorist dimension of that. I would just as soon not do that in this particular forum.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Becton, let me go back to perhaps a little more pedestrian question.

Many of the previous spending abuses involved FEMA's training facility at Emmitsburg, MD, and, as you know, received a great deal of publicity at one level or another.

What initiatives has FEMA taken to improve procurement at that particular facility, such as staff, and training, and oversight?

Mr. BECTON. As you know, sir, there is a GAO review audit in process right now. Additionally, we have had our own people, our experts, that is, my inspector general and personnel from acquisition management, up at Emmitsburg, working with the new leadership we have up there.

At the same time I had my confirmation hearings we brought in Associate Director Jim McNeill, who was confirmed with me, and moved up to Emmitsburg. His No. 1 marching orders from me basically have been "let's find out what the facts are; if we have false allegations, clarify those; if we have problems, clean them up."

And I have charged Jim with the mission of cleaning up our act, if that is necessary.

I think we have taken giant steps to do exactly that. We have gotten sole source under control. We are taking a look at the other contracts. And I believe that we are doing the kinds of things that are prudent businesslike approaches to take.

Mr. DELLUMS. If strategic home porting comes to realization—I might just add parenthetically, yesterday we had an all day set of hearings on this policy of home porting the Navy. If it becomes a reality at Staten Island, NY, and Everett, WA, where nuclear capable ships will be home ported, could the present civil defense resources from your perspective, and I'm simply asking your judgment at this time, in those two areas deal with a nuclear accident, and if not, what additional resources would be required, and what would be needed at the proposed gulf coast and west coast sites in order to respond?

Mr. BECTON. I think in order to give a very meaningful answer, I would like to submit that particular response for the record.

I would point out that in both cases we have a region in Bothell, WA, and one in New York City. We are working very closely with

the States right now in other areas which would deal with that type of thing.

As I'm sure you are aware, we just conducted an exercise to assist the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in Long Island to determine whether a license should be issued.

So it's not an issue that we're not considering, but I cannot respond to the specific details as to what are the levels of preparedness in the States at this time.

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate that. So you'll submit a more detailed answer for the record

[The following information was received for the record.]

Question. If strategic home porting cames to realization—I might just add parenthetically, yesterday we had an all day set of hearings on this policy of home porting, thc Navy. If it becomes a reality at Staten Island, New York, and Everett, Washington, where nuclear capable ships will be home ported, could the present civil defense resources from your perspective, and I'm simply asking your judgment at this time, in those two areas deal with a nuclear accident, and if not, what additional resources would be required, and what would be needed at the proposed Gulf Coast and West Coast sites in order to respond?

Answer. Civil defense funds are used to develop emergency response plans for all hazards, at the local community level, potentially including response to a nuclear weapons or reactor accident related to home porting. However, funds have not been spent on response planning for home porting at this time by local communities.

We have for some time participated in discussions with the Department of Defense related to the appropriations of Radiological Preparedness Programs around DOD facilities. It is our understanding that DOD intends to issue guidance for State and local governments related to this issue. Off-site Federal assistance is provided to State and local governments through the Federal Radiological Emergency Response Plan (FRERP), the operational Federal Plan (published in the Federal Register on Nov. 8, 1985) for response to major peacetime radiological emergencies.

As to the sufficiency of civil defense and other available resources, it is impossible to speak to this issue without specification of the number and location of jurisdictions as well as an agreement on the nature of planning required. We are not in a position to estimate additional resource requirements until we can study with DOD and DOE, home porting locations and in turn, the extent of planning necessary.

FEMA welcomes the opportunity to coordinate with DOD and DOE that guidance which is required to assist State and local government to develop response plans which will enhance these governments' readiness to deal with a nuclear weapons accident in connection with Navy porting.

Mr. BECTON. We will, sir.

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate that.

The Chair would just like to indicate to both you and Mr. Alderman that yesterday during the course of the testimony we received on home porting, one of our witnesses, for example, in dealing with the policy that we have neither confirming nor denying whether a ship carries nuclear weapons, made the suggestion, made the recommendation that what we ought to simply do is to say that the ships are nuclear capable.

Soviet Union, when they learn that one of our ships is nuclear capable, they have to plan in a worst case scenario, so they assume if it's nuclear capable, it's nuclear equipped, and they operate from that perspective.

He was suggesting that in order to deal with the issue of potential accidents, population movement, what have you, that if the Department of Defense simply stated that the ships were nuclear capable, did not make a statement about whether they actually had the equipment on them, that then the state and local jurisdictions could go forward with appropriate planning given that posture.

But if we continue the policy of not confirming nor denying, we in many ways handicap the State and local communities from being able to make appropriate plans to try to address the possibility of an accident in these heavily populated areas where home porting is moving toward a reality.

Take a situation like Staten Island, NY—to at least say they're nuclear capable, allowing the people to say well, if they're nuclear capable, let's plan for the worst case, then we can go forward with the appropriate plans in the event of an accident.

Did you want to respond to that? I was simply indicating to you that that was one of the recommendations that one of our witnesses made. If you feel that you can comment to that at this point I will appreciate it. If not, we'll move on.

Mr. ALDERMAN. Mr. Chairman, my only comment would be I will take that as a recommendation of the Chair and carry it back.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you.

Because his thought was that this was in no way a breach of security, that it simply said that they're capable, and then you can make the necessary plans based upon the implications of that.

Mr. Becton, last year, 1985, was probably one of the worst years in recent history, as you pointed out in your litany of natural disasters. It seems that floods and hurricanes were clearly news virtually every month.

With what has already happened in California, 1986 may very well challenge 1985.

How much of the funds authorized by this committee for civil defense were used in support of natural disasters, and did the development of your fiscal year 1987 budget include concerns for the increased number of natural disasters where you may have to draw resources from the funds allocated by this subcommittee, by this committee?

Mr. BECTON. Thank you, sir. I'm going to ask Dr. Speck to respond to that because that's specifically his area, State and local governments.

Mr. SPECK. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, first I would point out that the disaster money that is allocated directly for public assistance and individual and family assistance is under the President's Disaster Relief Fund a separate element in the budget. So that when we talk about any relief for disaster victims, any part of the Federal recovery element, we're talking about a separate element of the budget rather than civil defense.

The civil defense side of the budget is used to develop a capability for being able to respond to the threat. And I would have to say that when you're talking about building a capability to warn people, to provide direction, and control, to provide life support services—all of the things that we're talking about in building that generic all-hazard capability in civil defense—you're talking about developing your emergency operating plans with their annexes for the various threats in that particular area, whether it be flooding, earthquake, or what have you, as well as attack-related preparedness. You're building an overall generic capability to respond to whatever disaster—including the flooding you've got right now in California.

I don't think that you can shake off and say this percentage of civil defense dollars went to these specific disasters. I think what you can say is that you were building a generic capability, an all hazard capability, with those civil defense dollars in California. That generic capability was useful in responding to the disasters in warning the people, in using your population protection evacuation plans to get them out of flood areas, and in being able to give them direction and control. That's the way I think we have to answer the question.

I think that really about does it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Let me frame the question a little differently.

FEMA's guidance for fiscal year 1985, comprehensive cooperative agreements with the States, stated that funds from line items such as civil defense, could be used to meet radiological emergency preparedness program requirements provided that the other programs' needs were met first.

How much funding support did civil defense provide for other programs in fiscal 1986? What assurances do you have that the civil defense needs were met first in these cases, and is this guidance still in effect? Let's rephrase that question a little differently.

Mr. SPECK. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, we'll see if we can provide you something for the record. I don't know that we have any figures like that broken out, but we'll certainly make an effort to be responsive.

Mr. DELLUMS. Then in the course of that response can you tell us what actions are you taking to insure that previously noted cases of using civil defense funds for other FEMA objectives did not occur in the last fiscal year? Would that be part of the response?

Mr. SPECK. One of the things that we had just finished doing, following the congressional guidance, and in keeping with the Director's admonition to be strictly right with the budget, is moving to a position management system, both at headquarters and in the regions. This required identifying what each person is doing precisely within a program area, down to the dollars assigned for that particular position.

This position management approach eliminates some of the flexibility that our regional directors had, and it made it difficult sometimes to be certain of exactly where people were being used. That can be a little bit of a downside in flexibility in the regions.

But it is certainly going to be responsive to a concern about how people being funded under one act can be used specifically for activities under that act.

I think we can give you an assurance that we have taken the steps to make certain that when you provide appropriation under one act, the people are going to be used for purposes of that act, save for any kind of limited reprogramming authorities that we have under law.

Mr. BECTON. I feel quite comfortable, Mr. Chairman, that, as we get further into this fiscal year, we will see some of the procedures we have implemented. Then we will be able to give a more definitive answer in terms of what percentage, or moneys, or the amounts.

Mr. DELLUMS. Are there any additional questions?

Mr. RAY. Does the staff have any additional follow-on questions?

Then Mr. Becton, Mr. Alderman, and colleagues, we'd like to thank you very much for your contribution to the proceedings this morning.

I might say, Mr. Becton, we have a few additional questions that we would like to submit to you and ask you to respond in writing for the record. They are questions that we don't need to go into at this particular point. They will require some detail, and some more pedestrian kinds of issues, and we'll just submit those questions and ask that you respond for the record.

[The following questions were submitted to be answered for the record.]

Question 1. The FEMA budget submission for Fiscal Year 1987 states that the civil defense request is to provide continuity while the outlines of new civil defense policies and directions are being resolved. A report on civil defense objectives, policies, and programs was due March 3, 1986. Will a report be provided on that date? If not, when will the report be provided?

Answer. FEMA provided the Chairman of the Subcommittee a communication requesting that the due date be extended to July 3, 1986. At the hearing on February 27, 1986, the Chairman indicated that the request for an extension would be favorably considered (". . . the Subcommittee will see to the request.")

Question 2(a). FEMA's guidance for Fiscal Year 1985 Comprehensive Cooperative Agreements with the States stated that funds from line items such as civil defense could be used to meet Radiological Emergency Preparedness program requirements, provided that the other programs' needs were first met. How much funding support did civil defense provide for other programs in Fiscal Year 1985? What assurances do you have that civil defense needs were met first in these cases? Is this guidance still in effect?

Answer. It is our finding from dealing with State and local officials that to a great extent capability building for emergency response can be applied to the entire spectrum of national security, natural, and technological hazard threats. It is impossible to separate the purposes and usage of these emergency resources and specifically identify an amount of civil defense dollars attributable to other than civil defense. For example, civil defense funds used to support agency overhead in Regional Offices contribute to other programs, but do not detract from attack preparedness. The same is true of program funds for population protection; radiological defense; emergency management assistance; direction, control and warning; and training.

Question 2(b). We understand that the recently publicized Theodore Barry Associates contracts for technical assistance involving a nuclear power plant in New York were initially justified and funded as a Radiological Emergency Preparedness activity, but subsequently funded by civil defense. Is this an example of budget pressures resulting in civil defense funds being used for other objectives?

Answer. FEMA believes that the use of civil defense funds in Fiscal Year 1986 for the Theodore Barry and Associates contract was appropriate. The funds involved were returned to FEMA from the States because they were in excess of their needs. Their use in the Theodore Barry contract contributed to emergency preparedness and was consistent with the dual use concept approval by the Congress. Furthermore, the use of these funds was done within the reprogramming limits established by the Congress.

Question 2(c). What actions are you taking to ensure that previously noted cases of using civil defense funds for other FEMA objectives do not recur?

Answer. It is the responsibility of FEMA to perform stewardship over the conduct of its programs, the same as any other Federal agency that administers grant-in-aid programs. If appropriate use of the grant funds is brought to the attention of FEMA grant program managers, it is their responsibility to take appropriate actions to rectify the situation.

Question 3. Does the fiscal year 1987 budget request for civil defense now include only the bare minimum required for activities directly supporting civil defense, or is there a margin of funds that can be used for other activities such as Radiological Emergency Preparedness (REP), or FEMA's overall Management and Administration?

Answer. The 1987 civil defense request is the bare minimum for civil defense activities which include regional management and administration.

Our budget justifications and the underlying authorizing statutes intend that funds appropriated for the civil defense activity, in fact, be spent on the civil de-

fense programs. The proper relationship between civil defense and REP and the one that governs how we use the funding involved is that civil defense builds capability at the state and local level for emergency management for all hazards and emergencies while REP focuses on fixed nuclear facilities and FEMA's regulatory responsibilities in evaluating off-site emergency preparedness. The activities are discrete and we do not believe there is any "margin" in the civil defense justifications that would permit civil defense funds to be used on the REP program. If at the end of the fiscal year, funds are returned by the states, they would be used as effectively as possible for emergency preparedness consistent with program requirements and FEMA's reprogramming authority.

FEMA's overall management and administration is funded, by the Management and Administration activity in the Budget. This covers all agency-wide direction and management. No civil defense funds may be or are used for Headquarters Management and Administration and the Headquarters staff offices. The civil defense activity does, however, fund the regional offices' management and administration from the State and Local Emergency Management Program. Civil defense has, since Fiscal Year 1983, funded the regional offices' management and administration costs.

Question 4. We understand that some States which receive civil defense funds have laws which restrict nuclear attack preparedness planning. What controls does FEMA have to ensure that State recipients of civil defense funds spend at least a portion of the funds for nuclear attack preparedness planning? If a State does not comply with FEMA guidance, does FEMA withhold funds?

Answer. In late 1981, Congress mandated the Civil Defense Act of 1950 to include provisions for dual use (i.e., attack-related and disaster-related civil defense). Section 207 of the Act states that "Funds made available to the States under this Act may be used by the States for the purposes of preparing for, and providing emergency assistance in response to natural disasters to the extent that the use of such funds for such purposes is consistent with, contributes to, and does not detract from attack-related civil defense preparedness.

The Act (e.g., Section 207) not only permits, but in fact requires FEMA to deny financial support authorized by the statute to States or jurisdictions where they are not performing in accordance with the provisions of the laws and appropriate regulations.

Every reasonable effort through formal negotiations with State and local jurisdictions is made to avoid a situation of stark refusal by a jurisdiction to participate in any aspect of nuclear attack preparedness. However, FEMA policy was clearly articulated in the following quote from our Director's February 27, 1986, statement before the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives:

"Nuclear attack preparedness will never be achieved solely through an all-hazard, capability-building approach. Preparedness for nuclear attack requires, for the most part, the same kinds of emergency capabilities needed for peacetime emergencies. But nuclear attack so far exceeds the extent and severity of even the most catastrophic of natural disasters, that reliance solely on an all-hazards, capability-building from the bottom up will not result in real attack preparedness. The Federal Emergency Management Agency remains committed to an all-hazard, capability-building approach as the best way to improve basic emergency capabilities, which moves us a significant way toward attack preparedness. But the experience of the past several years shows we must also direct resources to attack-specific requirements that will not otherwise be met.

We propose to assure, therefore, that the 1981 language is implemented in our management of funds appropriated under the Civil Defense Act—that all funds provided to the States for attack preparedness will be used consistent with that objective and to the greatest extent practicable continue to contribute to preparedness for all disasters, be they natural or manmade.

We cannot predict with precision just what the result of such an approach would be. We are confident that in the large majority of cases, State and local governments would be in full accord. The possibility remains, however, that we might in a few cases, after discussion and negotiation, be required to decide whether funds should be reallocated from a jurisdiction which did not choose to pursue a genuinely all-hazards program, including attack preparedness, to other jurisdictions which did."

FEMA relies upon the Comprehensive Cooperative Agreement (CCA) process to provide State recipients guidance on civil defense program requirements. The CCA process also provides FEMA a means to specify acceptable outputs, monitor progress, and identify the shortfall through a product oriented quarterly reporting system.

Further, this process provides FEMA the ability to identify areas of noncompliance and the means to take the appropriate action which could range from a warning and remedial instructions to the withdrawal or withholding of funds.

Question 5. In Fiscal Year 1985, about $28 million in civil defense funds were spent using interagency agreement awards with or through other government agencies. How does FEMA insure that such awards are more cost effective in acquiring goods and services than contract awards to the private sector?

Answer. In accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation and Economy Act, FEMA places an order for supply of services with other agencies when the other agency has a particular expertise or knowledge that will allow the other agency to obtain the goods and services on a more cost effective basis than could be obtained by FEMA. This policy as provided for in the regulations and, as followed by FEMA, ensures that the interagency agreements are generally more cost effective than contract awards to the private sector. Moreover, the Federal Acquisition Regulation does not have a specific requirement to perform such a cost effectiveness study except when the requesting agency is acquiring commercial or industrial activities. FEMA generally does not award interagency agreements under the latter condition.

Question 6. Many of the previous spending abuses involved FEMA's training facility at Emmitsburg, MD. What initiatives has FEMA taken to improve procurement at Emmitsburg, such as staffing, training, and oversight?

Answer. There are a number of initiatives and controls in place to improve the procurement activities at NETC. These include:

The establishment of a procurement planning process which requires all procurements of $25,000 be approved in advance by a committee composed of FEMA Headquarters staff.

All sole source procurement must be approved by a level above the contracting officer and, in certain cases, must be approved by the Competition Advocate located in FEMA Headquarters. In January of 1985, the Director of FEMA designated that the Chief of the Policy and Evaluation Division of the Office of Acquisition Management would be the Agency's Competition Advocate.

The procurement authority at NETC has been reduced and all procurements at a certain level must be reviewed by the General Counsel and other review officials.

A number of reviews of the procurement operations have been conducted by FEMA Headquarters procurement experts and the FEMA Inspector General is currently conducting a complete audit of all NETC contracts and grants.

Training sessions have been conducted for all NETC project officers to acquaint them with the requirements and responsibilities related to the procurement process.

Question 7. Executive Order 12352, dated March 17, 1982, (Procurement Reform) requires that the FEMA procurement executive: (1) establish criteria to improve the effectiveness of procurement systems, (2) evaluate procurement system performance, and (3) certify that the procurement system meets the approved criteria. Has FEMA complied with this Presidential document reform order? If not, when does FEMA expect to do so?

Answer. We are in the process of complying with the Executive Order, but some of our target dates have slipped because of limited staff resources to devote to these activities. We have experienced a 30 percent staff reduction in the past year, but we have not had any reduction in our procurement workload. Our target is to complete these activities by early Fiscal Year 1987.

Again, we'd like to thank you. We congratulate you on your new responsibilities, and we hope that your career continues to be long and illustrious.

Mr. BECTON. I intend to enjoy my retirement. Thank you.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you very much.

Oh, just one brief admonishment. Just so that everyone knows, and it's not directed simply at you folks, but all the witnesses, according to our rules that govern our Armed Services Committee, we must have statements to the full committee, and to the subcommittee, 48 hours in advance of the hearing, and that in the future we would appreciate it if we could get them 48 hours in advance. That gives us an opportunity to review earlier because it's sometimes very difficult to try to do an adequate job of review and asking appropriate questions if you only get the testimony a very short period of time. This way we can read it a day or so before.

We get a chance to go over the questions with each other, talk about the areas where we desperately need information, and when they come—and I think everyone on the witness list submitted their testimony—some just today. It makes it extremely difficult for us to carry out our job responsibly. And we'd appreciate it if in the future we could get testimony in accordance with the rules that govern our proceedings.

Mr. BECTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. I accept the admonition. We will make every effort to get them over earlier. We still have disasters in our own business in trying to get paperwork, and names, and so forth.

Mr. DELLUMS. Oh, I understand that. In the real world these things happen from time to time, but today all the witnesses' testimony came late, so I figured it wouldn't be prejudicial to sort of spread it out by just simply restating the rules, and we understand, and these things happen.

Mr. BECTON. Yes, sir. Thank you.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you very much.

Mr. ALDERMAN. You must have been a bad guy.

Mr. BECTON. One of us was.

Mr. DELLUMS. The Chair would like to call forward our next witnesses, Mr. Donald A. DeVito, president, National Emergency Management Association; and also Mr. Ellis Stanley, president, National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management.

I'd like to bring both gentlemen forward. And we would like to welcome both of you this morning, and appreciate your taking the time to appear before the subcommittee, and we would begin with Mr. DeVito.

Mr. DEVITO. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, let me state that I'm one of those who have been somewhat remiss and tardy in getting written testimony in, and for that I apologize, and beg the indulgence of this committee.

Mr. DELLUMS. That's quite all right.

STATEMENT OF DONALD A. DeVITO, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. DEVITO. I would like to thank this committee for the opportunity to comment on that portion of the FEMA budget which is identified as civil defense.

Mr. DELLUMS. Might I say at the outset that without objection, the full text of both the gentlemen's statements will appear at the appropriate point in the record. You may proceed in any fashion you choose.

Mr. DEVITO. I appreciate that, sir. I have no intention of reading the entire statement, but submit it for the record.

Instead let me address myself to a few comments.

In the beginning, please recognize that the National Emergency Management Association, which is essentially an organization of representatives of the Governors of the 50 States, and the various territories and insular areas, is part of a rather extensive coalition that involves the National Governors Association, the National Association of Counties, the Coordinating Council on Emergency Management, represented here today, and others. We are in unanimity

with respect to a request before this body at greater concern given for those areas that we have identified as vital to the public safety of this Nation, five specific programs enumerated in the text, which are passed through funding for State and local capabilities.

Our purposes in the emergency management community is to promote the use of all resources at every level of government to deal with all hazards. We see ourselves as part of a symbiotic partnership, Federal, State, and local government.

But there is a basic premise that underscores all of this, and I think it is appreciated by virtually all of the State directors of emergency management throughout the Nation, and that is that local government is the front line in the emergency or disaster business, and it is there where we must focus our efforts and our resources.

In looking at the FEMA budget for this year with its application of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction effort, it is tempting to compare the budget proposal with the estimates for fiscal year 1986. In doing that, one could conclude that the impact overall on civil defense programs is only at the level of 3 percent, and in looking at those five critical programs that I mentioned earlier, that, again, the level was somewhat less than 3 percent. That is somewhat misleading, sir.

The point of fact is that deficit reductions began in this arena, as you know, back in 1984, and the transition from 1984 to 1985. If one makes comparisons then back to a base year of 1984, it becomes apparent that the reductions in the programs funded by this Congress for the public safety in this Nation, the cuts are on the order of some 20 percent or higher.

We would argue, sir, that that was not the intent of Congress. We don't believe it was at the time. We don't believe it is now, that the level of reductions should be so severe that they, in effect, constitute a very adverse degradation of the capability of State and local governments to deliver public safety programs to the people we are sworn to serve.

That includes all of those programs identified as civil defense, because in reality the programs, specifically the ones in which we are most concerned, in reality those programs provide the resources, the personnel, the equipment, the infrastructure, if you will, to deal with any hazard that may threaten the public safety across this Nation.

I understand you have heard a litany of those described that have affected us in 1985. We are, as you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, facing devastation almost equal in terms of its total damage to the entire disaster relief appropriation from FEMA last year. That is, from what we understand, the damages in northern California right now are in the order of some $380 million, and the total disaster relief effort last year, pursuant to Public Law 93-288, was some $387 million, if my memory serves me correctly.

We argue then, sir, that if cuts are necessary, that those reductions must come from elsewhere in this budget, and that particularly those five specific programs, State and local emergency management, radiological defense effort, population protection, state and local direction and control and warning, and training and edu-

cation, should be held harmless as compared to the enacted levels of 1986.

Even at that, compared to the base year, we are still faced with an overall reduction of almost 19 percent from the base.

Many have argued in looking at the need to find a different way to do the funding in this emergency business, that cost sharing formulas must be reexamined, and that perhaps states and their localities must pick up a greater share of the burden.

Even setting aside the negative effects of the cuts in revenue sharing on States and their localities, the reality is that States and localities presently bear a disproportionate share of the burden in emergency management.

In using New York for an example, we've calculated out that some 70 percent or more of the support for those programs, specifically identified in civil defense, comes from the State and local levels. Many of them, for example, State hard dollars not matched by Federal funds.

So we believe that the answer does not lie in a different cost-sharing ratio that would increase the burden on State and local governments.

We accept the premise that there must be deficit reduction. We understand that, and we recognize that in our society we elect representatives to select from competing demands for diminishing resources to determine where those reductions need to be made.

All we can ask, and do ask, is that this body consider a more reasonable and prudent approach to the public safety issue facing all of us in this Nation so that whatever reductions are necessary they will be made with the full knowledge of the impact of those reductions on our ability to protect the people of this country.

We also ask in examining the restoration of funds for greater program flexibility in the delivery of whatever resources are made available to us at the State and the local level.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency has adopted a concept called the integrated emergency management system, a valuable system, that deals with the premise of the use of all resources at all levels to deal with all hazards. We support that.

What we ask is that in the application of that policy that FEMA recognize the diversity of the several States, and that rather than attempt to hammer all States and localities into a single mold, that a more reasonable approach be taken with respect to the application of national policy within the context of specific State and local concerns.

We recognize that FEMA by right should have audit and oversight responsibilities and authorities with respect to such granted flexibility.

We argue that the regional offices of FEMA are best suited, and best positioned, to work in concert with the States and their localities to determine what is most effective for those jurisdictions.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity, and I am prepared to answer any questions that you recall.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DONALD A. DEVITO

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA), thank you for the opportunity to appear before you and the members of the Subcommittee today to discuss that portion of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) FY 1987 budget request which deals with those programs categorized as "Civil Defense."

The National Emergency Management Association is an organization comprised of State Directors of Emergency Management and others from throughout the United States and its territories, who actively promote the principles of Comprehensive Emergency Management. The Association seeks to improve the interaction of all elements of the public safety community in order to develop a cohesive infrastructure for the protection of the public against all hazards, man-made or natural.

From the earliest history of this country, the protection of the public health and safety has been a concern of and a basic function for all levels of government. Numerous acts of our collective legislative bodies attest to this concern. The present system which has evolved to achieve this worthwhile objective, relies upon a partnership among Federal, State and local governments, as well as between the public and private sectors.

Through the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the role of the Federal Government has primarily been one of fiscal support, in the form of outright and matching grants to State and local governments. This support has enabled those organizations responsible for public safety to build and to maintain an infrastructure to coordinate the readiness for, response to, and recovery from the multitude of hazards which threaten their respective communities. This infrastructure also provides the administrative mechanism through which FEMA is able to disburse disaster assistance monies pursuant to Public Law 93-288, the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, following a declaration of an emergency or major disaster by the President. This same infrastructure coordinates the delivery of the disaster programs of other Federal agencies, such as the Small Business Administration, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers, for example.

The FEMA hazard identification process, in which more then 3,000 local governments have participated, has substantiated the fact that no community may be considered safe from any number of hazards which place significant populations at risk.

We have all become too familiar with the human suffering and property damage caused by natural phenomena such as flooding, landslides, hurricanes and earthquakes. The recent experience in several western states, most specifically northern California, where flooding and landslides forced the evacuation of tens of thousands of people and caused hundreds of millions of dollars in damage, reminds us of just how vulnerable we are.

In Calendar Year 1985 alone, twenty-seven major disasters affecting twenty states were declared by the President for a total of more than $387 million in eligible Federal disaster assistance funds. (See Attachment 1.) While this number is significant in itself, it does not begin to account for total damages, which are in the billions of dollars, nor for the thousands of incidents of a less catastrophic nature, which required a coordinated response by State and local emergency management officials across the nation--a response dependent, in large part, upon the resources provided through those programs labeled "Civil Defense."

In addition to those disasters caused by natural events, government officials and the public are becoming increasingly aware of and concerned about, those hazards which are a result of our growing dependence upon technology. The release of toxic materials into the environment, whether from fixed sites or from transportation-related accidents, is a prime example. Although we cannot reverse the trend, we can, by maintaining an effective emergency management infrastructure throughout the nation, be better prepared to minimize the adverse impact of this and other types of hazards upon the public.

The utilization of "civil defense" resources in this role, has proven to be a truly effective means by which to accomplish our mutual goal of Comprehensive Emergency Management.

As professional Emergency Managers representing State and local governments throughout the nation, we fully recognize the need to reduce the national deficit and realize that to achieve this end, we, as well as others, must endure the difficult transition period ahead as national priorities are redirected. Our national leaders must recognize, however, that to be remiss in providing sufficient funding for efforts to plan, to train, and to maintain the proper infrastructure to deal with disasters, will cause us to have to pay a significantly higher price in response and in our recovery efforts; not only in dollars, but also in terms of human suffering and lives lost.

It is with this in mind that we address the Administration's proposed "Civil Defense" budget for Fiscal Year 1987.

The portion of the FEMA budget identified as "Civil Defense" is the area of primary concern to State and local governments. It is in this category, where are found the program elements which pass through to States and their localities the Federal share of emergency management funding to support the public safety infrastructure necessary to cope with all hazards, man-made or natural, across these United States.

In an analysis of this budget, it is tempting to relate the agency request for FY 1987, with its application of the provisions of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation, to the FY 1986 estimate, which also incorporates the deficit reduction efforts of that legislation. If that approach is taken, it would appear that the overall reduction for civil defense is only on the order of 3.2 percent.

The impact is more severe. Let me explain.

From our perspective, there are five specific program categories that are particularly critical to State and local efforts in emergency management. They are State and Local Emergency Management; the Radiological Defense Program; the Population Protection planning effort; State and Local Direction Control and Warning; and the program category identified as Training and Education. (See Attachment 2.)

If one makes a comparison of the funding estimates for FY 1986 against the proposal for FY 1987 in those specific areas, it would appear that

the overall reduction for State and local program efforts is less than 3 percent. However, in dealing with the impact of this budget on the State and local capacity to deliver effective public safety programs nationally, we must go beyond such a simple temptation and, instead, relate back to the levels of funding originally intended for emergency management efforts in FY 1986. It makes even more sense to reflect back on the actual expenditures in these areas for fiscal years 1984 and 1985, when the deficit reduction efforts first began, to fully appreciate just how significant the adverse impact is, has been, and is proposed to be on states and their local governments in this vital area of public safety.

Attached is a chart which reflects the actual funding by program for FY 1984 and FY 1985 as well as the level of funding enacted in FY 1986. (See Attachment 3.) It incorporates the FY 1986 estimate based on the application of the provisions of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and the FEMA request for FY 1987. The program areas are subdivided into three separate parts; the first deals with those elements which provide direct financial assistance to state and local governments; the second involves those programs that are managed exclusively at the Federal level; and finally, FEMA salary and expenses are separately identified. Taken in total, these constitute "Civil Defense" program funding.

We have endeavored to show both the dollar amounts and the percentile changes between the current budget request and the various levels of funding enacted or experienced prior to deficit reductions, so as to illustrate the magnitude of the decline in resources made available from the Federal government. For example, we make a comparison between the present request and the actual expenditures in FY 1984. By such examination, it becomes obvious that the effect on the states and their localities is significantly greater than the conclusions that could be drawn if one simply analyzed the post Gramm-Rudman-Hollings fiscal effects. While it may be proposed that the change from FY 1986 to FY 1987 is little more than 3.2 percent overall in the civil defense category, by comparing it to the beginning year (FY 1984) when declines were first applied, note that it is greater than a 24

percent reduction overall. In those program elements of primary concern to States and their localities, the magnitude of the overall reduction from the base year of FY 1984 is also greater than 24 percent.

We do not believe that it is the intention of Congress to apply such significant levels of reduction to those programs of such vital concern to the safety of all of the citizens of the country and which are delivered by the professional emergency managers represented by this Association.

Further, it is unreasonable to expect that States and their localities can afford to correct the deficiencies represented by this overall fiscal plan.

States and their localities are already providing significant levels of support for all manner of public safety programs. In fact, by our estimates, we conclude that they fund some 75 to 85 percent of the resources for emergency management programs, including for those programs identified within the FEMA fiscal system as "Civil Defense."

As we have previously stated, the members of the National Emergency Management Association appreciate the need for deficit reduction and recognize that dramatic action is necessary to correct this grave national problem. However, we argue that the magnitude of change should not be so great as to seriously degrade our capability to provide meaningful public protection programs. We do not believe that the Congress desires that, as we do not believe that this present budgetary proposal carries out the stated intention of Congress to provide for a meaningful program of civil defense to protect our citizens throughout this nation against all hazards which threaten their lives and their property.

All we ask, is that those programs which we have specifically identified as vital to State and local efforts for emergency management be held harmless with respect to any further deficit reduction that is being contemplated by the Congress (i.e., State and Local Emergency Management, Radiological Defense, Population Protection, State and Local Direction, Control and Warning, and Training and Education). To

that end, we recommend that approximately $6.4 million be restored to these program elements to raise FY 1987 funding to the FY 1986 enacted level of $91.5 million.

By restoring the level of funding in the five programs in question to $91.5 million, we are in effect proposing, among other things, the reinstatement of the student stipend program for the Emergency Management Institute. It is our contention that absent these stipends, there will be a severe reduction in the number of students that could make themselves available for the vital training and education programs that are delivered by the Institute. It is axiomatic in emergency management that education and training are fundamental to hazard mitigation and that hazard mitigation is less expensive than disaster assistance. Therefore, we believe that the elimination of the student stipend proposed in this budget is not only unsound but is counterproductive to effective emergency management.

Since this Association last testified before this body, the nation has been traumatized by a series of major disasters. These disasters have extracted a severe toll in terms of lives lost, human suffering and property damage. As we move into the future, we have no assurances that the grim lessons of the recent past will not be repeated time and again in the weeks and months ahead. Thus, it is only reasonable and prudent that every level of government do all that it can to insure that the necessary resources are in place to deal with the potential havoc that could be raised by natural phenomena and by those disasters caused by our increasingly complex society and the multitude of man-made hazards attendant thereto.

The concept is fundamental. We, at every governmental level, have a choice in the funding of this emergency management business. We can either provide the funds up-front; so that our preparedness efforts, that is the multitude of readiness activities such as public awareness and education, planning, training, and the building of appropriate infrastructures to carry out an effective emergency response are all put in place as part of a hazard mitigation effort or, failing that, the reality is that we will pay significantly greater amounts in disaster relief assistance after the disasters occur--as they surely will! It

is a simple matter of pay now or pay later. But pay we will. We, in NEMA, believe that if the Congress provides the necessary funding resources now to assist State and local government efforts, the cost will be significantly less later--not only in terms of dollars, but also in terms of the human suffering involved.

Even with funding levels restored to the FY 1986 enacted levels, we still are faced with a number of problems with respect to the delivery of programs for emergency management. These can be significantly abated if FEMA were to adopt more flexible guidelines for the conduct of its programs. The Federal Emergency Management Agency has implemented a concept called the Integrated Emergency Management System. Basically stated, it is the use of all resources, at every level of government, to deal with all hazards, man-made or natural. It seems to us that the resources available through specific programs identified under the category "Civil Defense" could be granted a more reasonable level of flexibility. In this way, resources could be interchanged between all programs so as to carry out broad national policies, in the context of specific State and local requirements. National preparedness exists only at the grass roots level of local government; in the counties, cities, towns and villages of this nation. The orientation of the States and the Federal government must be directed towards the enhancement of local emergency management capabilities. By providing greater flexibility in the use of Federal resources to deal with those areas of specific concern to States and their localities, we can insure that the integrated emergency management system, as advocated by FEMA, becomes a reality rather than remaining a philosophy.

We, in NEMA, recognize that there must be audit and oversight accountability vested in the Federal Emergency Management Agency with respect to these programs. Those matters and specific workplan objectives can be resolved within the context of State and local requirements by staff at the Regional Offices of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. They are best positioned to deal with specific State concerns.

Programs that work in Texas may not have application in Tennessee. Connecticut's needs may not be relevant to California. Thus, we should not blindly adhere to rigid inflexible guidelines with respect to program delivery, but ought to make the relationship between the States and their local governments and FEMA a true partnership dedicated to seeking a more effective way to deliver vital programs of public safety at the local level where they are most needed.

To achieve a more flexible system, one which would recognize the diversity of the several states, the program category "Civil Defense" should be modified to incorporate the principles of the Integrated Emergency Management System. Then, States and their localities, operating under a concept of greater flexibility as regards the application of the limited resources available, could more reasonably tailor their emergency management programs to accommodate their specific concerns, while still meeting those broad guidelines required to fulfill national policies and goals.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate that the members of the National Emergency Management Association are fully cognizant of and appreciate the need for significant reductions in the federal deficit. We make these proposals in the full and certain knowledge that if the Congress fails to provide resources now to sustain the vital programs for public safety that have been developed over the past several years, a serious degradation in our capability to protect the people of this country will result. The consequence of that action will be that when disasters occur, as they most surely will, the cost will be significantly greater for our recovery efforts then would have been necessary had we made reasonable expenditures now to insure that every state in this Union has an appropriate infrastructure to deal with any hazard that might occur, and is able to pursue programs designed to minimize the adverse impact of disasters in the future. We, as members of the vast community of emergency managers throughout the nation, ask your help in assisting us to achieve these vital public safety goals.

ATTACHMENT 1

27 MAJOR DISASTERS DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT IN 1985

DATE of DECLARATION	STATE	TYPE	Total Federal Disaster Assistance[1]
Jan. 15	Arizona	Heavy Rain & High Winds	$ 976,241.00
Jan. 18	New Mexico	Severe Storms & Flooding	1,853,435.00
Mar. 18	Florida	Severe Freeze	10,019,250.00
Mar. 20	New York	Flooding	1,337,034.00
Mar. 22	New York	Snow Melt & Ice Jams	872,952.00
Mar. 29	Illinois	Severe Storms & Flooding	3,969,576.00
May 31	Puerto Rico	Storms, Mud/Land Slides, Flooding	20,166,602.00
June 3	Pennsylvania	Severe Storms, High Winds & Tornadoes	7,791,437.00
June 3	Ohio	Severe Storms & Tornadoes	2,985,524.00
July 18	California	Grass, Wildlands & Forest Fires	5,701,075.00
Aug. 7	Wyoming	Severe Storms, Hail & Flooding	3,489,220.00
Sept. 4	Mississippi	Hurricane Elena	24,074,592.00
Sept. 7	Alabama	Hurricane Elena	5,625,693.00
Sept. 12	Florida	Hurricane Elena	8,192,144.00
Sept. 18	Michigan	Severe Storms and Flooding	5,537,540.00
Oct. 8	Pennsylvania	Hurricane Gloria	8,102,056.00
Oct. 10	Puerto Rico	Severe Storms, Flooding & Mudslides	51,994,075.00
Oct. 11	Connecticut	Hurricane Gloria	12,007,561.00
Oct. 15	Rhode Island	Hurricane Gloria	4,802,304.00
Oct. 15	New Jersey	Hurricane Gloria	3,019,993.00
Oct. 18	New York	Hurricane Gloria	35,775,424.00
Oct. 28	Massachusetts	Hurricane Gloria	12,865,146.00
Nov. 1	Louisiana	Hurricane Juan	26,630,832.00
Nov. 7	West Virginia	Severe Storms & Flooding	87,381,492.00
Nov. 8	Pennsylvania	Severe Storms & Flooding	7,162,570.00
Nov. 9	Virginia	Severe Storms & Flooding	28,381,206.00
Dec. 3	Florida	Hurricane Kate	6,890,185.00
TOTAL			$387,605,159.00

[1] Represents assistance of the Federal Emergency Management Agency only. Does not include programs available under the authority of other Federal Departments or Agencies.

ATTACHMENT 2
CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAMS
ESSENTIAL TO THE PUBLIC SAFETY

State and Local Emergency Management: The foundation of the comprehensive emergency management effort at State and local levels. EMA is a cost-effective program and provides for a trained cadre of full-time emergency management personnel. The loss of any portion would undermine or impede the ability to respond to emergencies. EMA provides the only organizational funds that flow through states to local governments.

Radiological Defense: The increase of radiological uses in the private and public sector and the increase of transporation of low/high level waste generates a requirement for trained and immediately available personnel and equipment to respond to hazardous materials accidents.

Population Protection: Provides for all-hazards planning assistance by the States, for local government, which addresses all emergencies, man-made and natural. Included are evacuation and sheltering plans and emergency public information.

State and Local Direction, Control and Warning: The heart of all emergency management for state and local government; the loss of this program would destroy the ability to warn, control or to manage emergencies and would increase the vulnerability of our nation's citizens to disasters and emergencies.

Training and Education: The only program which allows for the professional development of emergency managers and for awareness efforts to inform other government officials and the general public. Provides continuity and uniformity of response procedures.

ATTACHMENT 3
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE FUNDING
1987 BUDGET REQUEST
(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

PROGRAM	(1) 1984 Actual	(2) 1985 Actual	(3) 1986 Enacted	(4) 1986 Estimate	(5) 1987 Request	Change Col (4) to (5)	Change Col (3) to (5)	Change Col (2) to (5)	Change Col (1) to (5)
* State & Local Emergency Management	$ 56.8	$ 58.4	$ 57.8	$ 55.3	$ 54.9	$- 0.4 (- 0.7%)	$- 2.9 (- 5.0%)	$- 3.5 (- 6.0%)	$- 1.9 (- 3.4%)
* Radiological Defense	10.3	10.1	9.7	9.3	9.2	$- 0.1 (- 1.1%)	$- 0.5 (- 5.2%)	$- 0.9 (- 8.9%)	$- 1.1 (- 10.7%)
* Population Protection	13.0	12.7	12.0	11.5	11.4	$- 0.1 (- 0.9%)	$- 0.6 (- 5.0%)	$- 1.3 (- 10.2%)	$- 1.6 (- 12.3%)
* State & Local Direction Control & Warning	18.5	12.0	0.6	0.5	0.5	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$- 0.1 (-17.0%)	$- 11.5 (- 95.8%)	$- 18.0 (- 97.3%)
* Training & Education	14.0	13.9	11.4	10.9	9.1	$- 1.8 (-16.5%)	$- 2.3 (-20.2%)	$- 4.8 (- 34.5%)	$ 4.9 (- 35.0%)
SUB-TOTAL[1]	$132.6	$107.1	$ 91.5	$ 87.5	$ 85.1	$- 2.4 (- 2.7%)	$- 6.4 (- 7.0%)	$- 22.0 (- 20.5%)	$- 27.6 (- 24.5%)
* Protection of Industrial Capability	$ 4.6	$ 1.5	$ 0.0	$ 0.0	$ 0.0	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$- 1.5 (-100.0%)	$ 4.6 (-100.0%)
* Research	5.6	4.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$- 4.0 (- 97.6%)	$- 5.5 (- 98.2%)
* Telecommunications & Warning	15.2	33.4	17.4	16.7	13.7	$- 3.0 (-18.0%)	$- 3.7 (-21.3%)	$- 19.7 (- 59.0%)	$- 1.5 (- 9.9%)
* Automatic Data Processing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$ 0.0 (0.0%)
SUB-TOTAL	$ 25.4	$ 39.0	$ 17.5	$ 16.8	$ 13.8	$- 3.0 (-18.0%)	$- 3.7 (-21.1%)	$- 25.2 (- 64.6%)	$- 11.1 (- 44.6%)
* FEMA Salaries & Expenses	$ 29.5	$ 27.7	$ 27.7	$ 26.5	$ 27.7	$+ 1.2 (+ 4.5%)	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$- 1.8 (- 6.1%)
(work years)	(661)	(564)	(500)	(500)	(508)	(+8)	(+8)	(-56)	(-153)
SUB-TOTAL	$ 29.5	$ 27.7	$ 27.7	$ 26.5	$ 27.7	$+ 1.2 (+ 4.5%)	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$ 0.0 (0.0%)	$- 1.8 (0.0%)
TOTAL CIVIL DEFENSE	$167.5	$173.8	$136.7	$130.8	$126.6	$- 4.2 (- 3.2%)	$-10.1 (- 7.4%)	$- 47.2 (- 27.2%)	$- 40.9 (- 24.4%)

[1] Sub total of Programs which provide direct financial assistance to State and Local Government.

45

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you very much, Mr. DeVito. What I think we'll do is ask Mr. Stanley to make his presentation and then we'll open it up with questions from both of you.

Mr. Stanley, please.

STATEMENT OF ELLIS STANLEY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL ON EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, ACCOMPANIED BY DAVE OBRYON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Ellis Stanley, president of the National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management, and I have with me here today Mr. Dave Obryon, our executive vice president.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Obryon, we'd like to welcome you.

Mr. OBRYON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STANLEY. I'm also a local emergency manager from Durham, NC, and it's a pleasure for the National Coordinating Council to testify before this committee.

In order—we do endorse today's testimony by the National Emergency Management Association. This statement encompasses our concern.

In order to meet the Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, emergency management assistance is essential. The local, State, Federal infrastructure is dependent on this funding.

As the subcommittee considers reauthorizing civil defense, NCEM offers several comments on several areas as follows:

A need for civil defense, and I'm speaking for the support of the emergency—the integrated emergency management system is apparent. In order to sustain the program effectively we must have trained personnel.

The administration has suggested doing away with the stipend program. Without it, training will be reduced. Rural and poor counties will not be able to absorb the expense. Western States who bear larger financial burdens will come to the east coast for training.

The result is clear. Civil defense, emergency management, will suffer.

The National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management would also be happy to undertake a study to more clearly show what effect this would have on the training and education of this country.

Further, it has been suggested the room and board policy be radically changed. The new financial burden likely would reduce institute attendance.

The Federal Government has a responsibility for national preparedness. Training leadership is part of that responsibility. Funding is an essential requirement.

In summary, we are deeply concerned that these contemplated policy changes will adversely affect the civil defense emergency preparedness program by undermining the opportunity for training. The program will be injured.

We urge the committee to take this matter under careful consideration. It is vitally important to the Nation.

Thank you very much for letting us testify before you today.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ELLIS STANLEY

I am Ellis Stanley, President of the National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management and I am a local emergency manager from Durham, North Carolina. It is a pleasure for NCCEM to testify before this committee.

The National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management (NCCEM), established since 1952 and formerly known as the U.S. Civil Defense Council, is a nationwide, nonprofit, private membership association representing the public interest in the realm of local government emergency preparedness. The membership of NCCEM, for the most part, consists of local emergency management and civil defense directors, whose role is saving the lives and protecting the property of our citizens on a daily basis.

Through the years our association has also come to include within the body of its membership other professional and technical personnel who work on a daily basis in the broad field of emergency response, preparedness, and management.

We endorse today's testimony by the National Emergency Managers Association. Their statement encompasses our concerns.

In order to meet the mandate of the Civil Defense Act of 1950 as amended, emergency management assistance is essential. The local—State—Federal infrastructure is dependent on this funding.

As the subcommittee considers reauthorizing civil defense programs, NCCEM offers comment on several areas as follows:

A need for civil defense is apparent. In order to sustain the program effectively, we must have trained personnel. The administration has suggested doing away with the stipend program. Without it training will be reduced. Rural and poorer counties will not be able to absorb the expense. Western states would bear a larger financial burden to come to the East Coast for training. The result is clear: civil defense will suffer.

Further, it has been suggested that the room and board policy be radically changed. The new financial burden likely would reduce institute attendance. The federal government has a responsibility for national preparedness. Training leadership is part of that responsibility. Funding is an essential requirement.

In summary, we are deeply concerned that these contemplated policy changes will adversely affect the civil defense/emergency preparedness program. By undermining the opportunity for training, the program will be injured. We urge the subcommittee to take this matter under careful consideration. It is vitally important to the Nation.

Thank you.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Stanley, for your opening remarks.

The Chair would like to just make a comment with respect to deficit reduction and Gramm-Rudman for whatever it's worth, and we'll try to ask a few questions.

I'm in total agreement with you that our approach to establish budget priorities ought to be based on some rational and intelligent process. I sit here as one person who strongly opposed Gramm-Rudman.

I strongly oppose Gramm-Rudman not only on constitutional grounds that it disrupts the comity between the executive and the legislative branch of government, I also perceive Gramm-Rudman to be a mindless approach to budgeting. My thought is that if you want to learn anything about a particular country and you only had one document that you could read, I would seek the national budget because the national budget of the nation establishes their priorities, what they perceive to be important, which, in turn, is based on their values.

And so I think that the budget ought to be the result of the rational approach, an intelligent process that leads to priorities.

I think Gramm-Rudman is a mindless approach that across-the-board percentage cuts in no way takes into consideration intellectual integrity, realities of the moment. It just seems to me bizarre.

Gramm-Rudman, in my estimation, also lacks compassion because once the computer locks in the percentages and you go right across all these categories that are not off the table, there's no compassion, no wisdom, no judgment.

And finally, I think Gramm-Rudman lacks accountability which leads to my third reason for opposing Gramm-Rudman. I personally believe that Gramm-Rudman flies in the face of the whole notion of Jeffersonian democracy, challenges the very concept upon which the Government is established; that is, a representative form of government where the people's representatives are in turn accountable for the judgments and the decisions that they make.

Gramm-Rudman, in my estimation, takes us outside the context of accountability, and it's like I've said in a more joking environment, that commercial where the two kids say "I'm not going to eat it. You eat it. No, let Mikey do it." Well, that's in effect what I think Congress did when it adopted Gramm-Rudman.

My colleagues on my side of the aisle said, the Democrats, I'm not going to do it because you've got to make tough decisions if you're going to deal with the politics of deficit reduction. The Republicans saying "I ain't either. Let Gramm-Rudman do it."

So everybody can now go home with incredible chaos and human misery being visited upon people across all of these areas, including the areas you gentlemen testified to this morning, and my colleagues can simply say "I didn't do it. Gramm-Rudman did it." So there's no accountability.

So for all three of those reasons, I'm in agreement with you that our approach ought to be based on some intelligent process that leads us to a rational set of human priorities, a compassionate set of human priorities, and a set of human priorities that we are directly held accountable for as we have established them.

Now, having said that, I'm on your side in that respect. So it leads us to two possibilities. Either we establish a budget based upon a mindless approach known as Gramm-Rudman, or we arrive at perhaps even the same budget figure but within that budget figure, a set of priorities that lead us to a rational set of programs and policies within that particular context.

Whether Gramm-Rudman is constitutional or not, if it goes away tonight, one of my little rhymes is that the politics of deficit reduction is not going away and 50–50 unfortunately is here to stay.

What I mean by that is whether Gramm-Rudman is a reality or not, my colleagues perceive deficit reduction, and they perceive that in the minds of the majority of the American people, deficit reduction is considered the ultimate issue This is election time, so Members tend to gravitate where they perceive energy.

And so I think the energy is in the politics of deficit reduction, Gramm-Rudman or not.

When I say 50–50 unfortunately is here to stay, it's that Gramm-Rudman, as you know, makes the 50–50 connection, 50 percent out of military, 50 percent out of nonmilitary. I don't think that there's any motivation on the part of my colleagues to support a budget that tilts beyond 50–50. If you take more than 50 percent out of the military, there's a large reservoir of my colleagues in the House who I think will oppose that budget. If you take larger than 50 percent out of nonmilitary items, there's a large group of people who

will go the other way, and I frankly don't think there's enough people in the middle who are willing to stand up and go home having visited that kind of pain on people with the budget that tilts one way or the other.

So I think the normal dynamics of things is that it's going to come back to this 50–50 anyway, Gramm-Rudman notwithstanding.

And so I think that that unfortunately is where we are. What we're trying to do in this subcommittee, we've talked, and we realize that this across-the-board checkoff, if it's 25 percent you just start 25 percent across-the-board. It makes no sense. We'd like to hang onto our responsibility and our sense of accountability. We want very much to try to establish priorities to the maximum extent possible.

I'm not totally convinced that absent revenue increase, and the President said "I don't want that," the Democratic leadership has said "if we want it I'm not going to go first. Look what happened to Walter Mondale." And the Republicans are saying "I'm not a fool either." So I'm not sure that there's any huge coalition. If it happens, that's great, but if it doesn't, I see Gramm-Rudman in one form or another sequestration process evolving rapidly and we'll come back to this 50–50. The question is, What process we use to get to it? We're advocating that we not abandon our responsibilities and try to come to some intelligent priorities.

So I hear both of you gentlemen loudly and clearly. And your statement is as much to us as it is to the FEMA Directors, I would assume, because we do appropriate a large sum, and within that priorities get established. And if I hear you correctly you're saying to us "we don't want a mindless across-the-board cut. Look at priorities. Look at our needs."

And I would assume you're also saying to FEMA in the context of your having to deal with the politics of deficit reduction on the administrative side, don't make cuts that disturb our capacity at the State and local level to carry out our responsibilities.

And that I ask the specific question how much money is saved in the room and board policy change, and the training stipend, and that comes to a total of $1.5 million, which in the broadest scheme of things is not an overwhelming amount of money, but from your perspective, more rural areas, and people who come from lower income communities, I'd like you to elaborate on that a little bit further for me, and both of you, on the training aspects of it, and tell me how you make your best case in that respect.

And, second, if you can be candid with respect to how you perceive the priorities that you're seeking being adequately addressed in the context of the lump sum figure that's being asked for by FEMA this morning.

Is that a fair enough question?

Mr. DEVITO. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. DELLUMS. So, before you go, I'm just saying that I think we hear. I hear you loudly and clearly. And we tend to agree in that respect; whether we can hold that or not, you know, there are dynamics far beyond this subcommittee that's going to determine that factor. If I had to put my money on it, I would bet Gramm-Rudman sequestration, and 50–50, because I think that's where the dynamics are, and I think that that's where things are going to go

because deficit reduction is here, and I think 50–50 is now in the minds of people, and I just think that that's where it's going to end up, but I don't see any motivation to do anything other than that, particularly in the context of an election year. That's just my opinion, but I'd like to think it's thoughtful and unfortunately may come to fruition.

Mr. DEVITO. Well, I appreciate the chairman's comments, and share his observations of the process.

With respect to the stipend issue, you are correct that the impact will be most severe on more rural areas that have relatively low levels of funding to support emergency efforts as things presently stand. To do away with the stipend, to deny not only emergency managers, but other government officials, and members of the private sector, the opportunity to go to a place such as the Emergency Management Institute where they can receive what we believe to be consistent and professional training with respect—and awareness with respect to this entire spectrum of emergency responsibilities, would be counterproductive to be sure.

It's somewhat axiomatic in our business that training and education is the fundamental premise behind hazard mitigation, and that hazard mitigation is a hell of a lot less costly than disaster assistance.

So we believe that it is clearly a case of putting money up front in order to assure the necessary training and education levels, and awareness on the part of many throughout the nation, so that when disaster strikes we are all in a better position to deal with it more intelligently and hopefully that way to mitigate its effects, and to minimize the suffering and property loss involved.

Without the stipends there will be a severe dent in the opportunity.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Stanley.

Mr. STANLEY. We are on the front line. We are the ones that have to respond on a daily basis to all contingencies that may occur at our local level. We are having to be cut in various ways, not only Gramm-Rudman, but other losses of funds at the local level.

And on the one hand we have to use the limited resources and manpower that we have to respond on a day-to-day basis, and on the other hand, we have to be knowledgeable on what we're doing with chemicals, for example. We need some central place that we can operate across the board, that we can train emergency managers so that the continuity of government that we try to establish with State and Federal Government can be consistent from one end to the other. We need to get them in one place.

EMI, Emergency Management Institute, strives to do that, but many of us cannot afford to get there simply because we have so many other things going on, staffs are limited, and the money is very short. Therefore, we need these stipends, and we need the room and board to handle it. We need to be able to be trained front-line respondents. And the only way we can afford and systematically do that is to have these stipends reinstated.

Mr. DELLUMS. If I hear both of you correctly, you both are saying, one, the need factor is there, and that it creates an economic hardship on some people if this stipend and the room-and-board

policies are changed. But I also hear a second argument, perhaps even the strongest argument that I would say to my colleagues, that is that if, indeed, attack-related civil defense is a national concern, then it seems to me strange that we place a heavier responsibility on State and local communities in that respect when this is, indeed, a national—if you ever talk about a potentially national disaster, attack-related civil defense disaster meets that category.

It seems to me that what you're saying is not only we need the funds, but also in terms of establishing continuity across the 50 States that the Federal Government's role in training has to be very clear and unequivocal, and you're suggesting that the stipend, and the room-and-board policies in some way infringe upon that, and detract from this national continuity. Is that correct?

Mr. DEVITO. Very definitely so, sir. Clearly, there is only one Emergency Management Institute in this Nation. It is the single place where all of us can go to at least receive consistent and clear dialog with respect to what are the problems, what are the means to mitigate those problems, relationships with the various communities that would pass through Emmitsburg for sharing ideas and concepts, and in such a way to improve our capability.

Mr. DELLUMS. I note that on page 8 of your prepared remarks, Mr. DeVito, you state that we recommend that approximately $6.4 million be restored to these program elements, the elements that you allude to in your opening remarks, to raise fiscal year 1987 funding to fiscal year 1986, an active level of $91.5 million.

Can you tell us where that $6.1 million would go?

Mr. DEVITO. That's derived by comparing, sir, the enacted levels for 1986 in those five programs, which was at the 91.5, with the 1987 request.

And what we're saying is that the money should be restored in those specific areas because it is those programs which provide a direct financial assistance to State and local governments.

And I might add, Mr. Chairman, that contained therein is the money for the stipend and lodging question. They are involved in that area of training and education.

Mr. DELLUMS. That was one of the questions that we wanted to note. That is part of this six point——

Mr. DEVITO. Yes, sir, it is. It's in the training and education line item.

Mr. DELLUMS. OK.

Mr. DEVITO. That, too, by the way, going back to your other question, outlines our priorities in the overall scheme of the FEMA budget.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Ray.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, you have articulated the questions and our position pretty well, and I just want to commend these gentlemen for good testimony, and it's enlightening, and I'll certainly do what I can to support your positions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Thank you, Mr. Ray.

Mr. DeVito, Mr. Stanley, I'd like to thank you, and Mr. Obryon, I'd like to thank you as well for participating in the proceedings. If any additional questions occur to us we will submit them and ask you to respond to us in writing. We appreciate your testimony. We

appreciate the thrust of your testimony, and we'll take your recommendations under advisement as we go forward to mark up of this legislation, along with the rest of our responsibilities here.

And you stay in touch with our staff. They'll let you know when there are any additional, or if and when there will be additional hearings, and what day we'll try to mark up this part of the bill. We'll certainly take your recommendations into consideration at that time.

Mr. DEVITO. Thank you.

Mr. STANLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. We are scheduled for markup, as I understand from staff, on the 12th of March. So that will more than likely be the date we'll take this matter up along with other military construction items that we'll be dealing with at that time.

And the subcommittee stands in adjournment subject to call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 11:23 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

61-457 (64)